

## SOME OBSERVATIONS ON THE COMPOSITION OF THE “CORE CHAPTERS” OF THE MOZI

ERIK W. MAEDER\*

The discovery of texts in ancient tombs has a healthy way of reminding us of the material condition of such texts as they were being passed on at a relatively early stage in the history of their transmission. They were then written on bamboo and silk, and as the finds at Yinqueshan 銀雀山 show, the jumbling of bamboo slips is to be expected when the bindings holding them rot and break.<sup>1</sup> The lengths of the slips on which the texts were written varied, at times considerably, and the slips themselves were prone to fragmentation. Chinese scholars have long been attentive to this fact and have been able to point to isolated instances where sequences of thirty-some to forty characters intrude into the natural flow of a sentence.<sup>2</sup> These may be best explained as the result of a copyist inadvertently entering a stray slip at that point.

Comparatively less thought seems to have been devoted, however, to the question of why bamboo slips could have been considered at one time as a convenient support for writing. The kind of easy transposition of material which bothers us today, when we are confronted with the product at the receiving end of transmission, might have seemed a virtue during the earliest stages in the history of a text. An analogy

---

\* Research for this paper has been funded by the Swiss National Science Foundation. I would like to thank Professors Robert G. Henricks, J.G.A. Pocock, Benjamin I. Schwartz, Kidder Smith, Jr., and Robin D.S. Yates for their early encouragements. Professor Angus C. Graham died too soon to see the first results of my study. I dedicate it to his memory.

1. See Wu Jiulong 吳九龍, *Yinqueshan Hanjian shiwen* 銀雀山漢簡釋文 (Beijing: Wenwu chubanshe, 1985).

2. Wu Yujiang 吳毓江, *Mozhi jiaozhu* 墨子校注 (Chongqing: Duli chubanshe, 1944), as reprinted in *Mozhi jicheng* 墨子集成, ed. Yan Lingfeng 嚴靈峰 (Taipei: Chengwen chubanshe, 1975), vols. 43–44, points to five such instances in the extant text of the *Mozhi*. The list is given in Angus C. Graham, *Later Mohist Logic, Ethics and Science* (London: SOAS and Hong Kong: Chinese University Press, 1978), 89.

might be made with the looseleaf ring binder into which miscellaneous material, including both class notes by different hands and documentary handouts, can be entered, only later to be rearranged, shortened or expanded as new material is found which is deemed pertinent, and as the compilers' concerns change.

As one pays more attention to the material condition of a text, some familiar devices for approaching it come to be seen as ill-adapted, if not plainly irrelevant to the task. One such device is the notion of authorship, which presupposes a form of continuity over time and a sense of closure as well: authors are expected to write more than a few sentences and their writings are considered to be wholes in the sense of having a beginning, a middle and an end. This sense of continuity and "linearity" is precisely what is put to the test when one comes to consider bamboo books in the manner suggested by their fragmented material appearance in tombs.

The notion of authorship is preserved when we confront writings in the form of printed books such as we know them today, and ancient silk manuscripts as well, such as the ones found at Mawangdui 馬王堆: they provide a strong sense of "linearity" which is merely reinforced by the observable continuity of the material used as support for the writing. It is of course true that in the long history of bamboo slips, compilers such as the Han bibliographers obviously had the exact preservation of "authoritative" texts in mind when they set out to reassemble and copy afresh writings which had already been transmitted to them in the partially "finished" form of *pian* 篇 ("bound roll of bamboo slips," a technical term which has generally been translated into English as "chapter"), that is, as already relatively closed "wholes."

The activity would not have been any different had the Han bibliographers chosen to copy the texts on silk. I nevertheless understand their choice of bamboo as a sign of a partially archaizing tendency, in what was already a "late" stage in a long and complicated history of composition and transmission within the different "schools" (or *jia* 家) and their respective posterities. If my simile stands, the use of bamboo can be best made sense of in the context of a still living and evolving tradition, as isolated slips and relatively short *ce* 冊 ("bound sets of bamboo slips" of a size corresponding to internally consistent "paragraphs" within a "chapter") are allowed to roam about more or less freely within the limits of an already constituted *pian*.<sup>3</sup>

---

3. See Tsien Tsuen-hsün, *Written on Bamboo and Silk. The Beginnings of Chinese Books and Inscriptions*, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962), 109, on the usages of *ce* and *pian*. I will have something more to say on this topic below.

The type of activity which must have gone on within the confines of such evolving traditions is hard to distinguish from what we have been in the habit of calling an “oral tradition”; but let us see that what is taken to be merely “oral” here must have been at least partially preserved from very early on in written form, and that the mere mention of the word “oral” only serves to point to the lack of formal unity within the text. If I can judge from my own study of the *Mozi*, a closer analysis of the text below the *pian* level can serve to introduce us into the so-called “oral tradition” itself, a task Angus Graham, whose work on the text has inspired my own, explicitly left for others to pursue.<sup>4</sup>

### The “*Mozi*” Text

The *Mozi* is certainly one of the most interesting ancient Chinese texts to analyze from the point of view of how form is related to the “materiality” of texts as they are found in ancient tombs. The text itself has been left relatively untouched through the ages, and ancient character forms can thus still be found which have been neither corrected nor “normalized” through the long process of transmission. The complete text seems to have practically disappeared from view for close to a millennium after Sui, to then be absorbed during Song and Ming times into the Daoist patrology (*Daozang* 道藏), before making its final return to general circulation only in the middle of the sixteenth century.<sup>5</sup>

The number of seventy-one *pian* listed in current editions of the text, which all seem to reach back through the Ming to a common Song ancestor, is the same as the one given more than a thousand years earlier in the Han bibliography (*Hanshu* “Yiwenzhi” 漢書藝文志). Graham was led by this fact to suggest that the Han text must have looked very much like the one we have today; for it seems to imply, with regard to the specific arrangement of the centrally situated “Logic” chapters which he was studying, “that the ‘Canons’ (‘Jing’ 經, *pian* 40 and 41) were already grouped separately from the ‘Explanations’ (‘Jingshuo’ 經說, *pian* 42 and 43), and ‘Expounding the canons’ (‘Yujing’ 語經) and half of ‘Names and objects’ (‘Ming shi’ 名實) already reduced to the fragments

4. See A.C. Graham, *Divisions in Early Mohism Reflected in the Core Chapters of Mo-tzu* (Singapore: IEAP, 1985), 28.

5. See in particular Alfred Forke, *Me Ti des Sozialethikers und seiner Schuler philosophische Werke* (Berlin: 1922), 5–15; Stephen W. Durrant, “An Examination of Textual and Grammatical Problems in Mo-tzu,” (Ph.D. diss.: University of Washington, 1975), 45–90; and Graham, *Later Mohist Logic*, 64–76. The textual authorities are described in detail in the Appendix to Wu Yujiang, *Mozi jiaozhu*. The *Daozang* text is reprinted in Yan Lingfeng, ed., *Mozi jicheng*, vol. 1.

collected in the 'Bigger pick' ("Daqu" 大取, *pian* 44)," the latter half of the last named document being preserved in a much better form within the extant "Smaller Pick" chapter ("Xiaoqu" 小取, *pian* 45).<sup>6</sup> In other words, considerable damage had already been done to the body of texts which were being transmitted as "Mohist" by the time the Han bibliographers set out under imperial auspices to reassemble them for posterity.

When the *Mozhi* was copied onto silk, the seventy-one *pian* that had been listed in the Han bibliography were made to occupy fifteen *juan* 卷 (or "rolls" of silk, another technical term which is often rendered as "book" in modern English translations), with the one-*pian* table of contents—first mentioned at the end of the Later Han—made to stand by itself as an independent sixteenth *juan*. This count in terms of *juan* is first attested in the seventh century *Suishu* 隋書 bibliography, but might actually date from earlier times.

Song citations from the mid-twelfth century on are notable for their first mention of a thirteen *pian* edition in three *juan*. This version is presented as a simple replica of the first three *juan* of the complete edition and must be the one which survives in the unpublished Yu 俞 manuscript, now in the Beijing National Library.<sup>7</sup> It seems to have originated under the Sui, and was the version commonly available under the Tang, by which time it had driven the complete version of the text out of circulation. Song sources are also notable for their citation of the contemporary Guan'ge catalogue (*Guan'ge shumu* 館閣書目), which has the peculiarity of giving sixty-one as the total number of *pian* found within the full fifteen *juan* edition. This number corresponds to the number of *pian* titles actually listed in the extant table of contents: ten "Defense" chapters are now missing, for which we have the *pian* number but not the titles.

A further eight chapters can presently be seen to be missing from within the block of "Essay" chapters (nominally *pian* 8 to 39, included in *juan* II to IX), although they are still mentioned by title in both text and table of contents with the added mention of "missing" (*que* 闕). *Pian* or chapters thus listed as "missing" in the extant text are to be found under the following titles: "Jieyong" 節用 (one), "Jieyang" 節葬 (two), "Ming-gui" 明鬼 (two), "Feiyue" 非樂 (two), all listed as actual triads, as well as under "Fei Ru" 非儒 (one), a mere diad. The missing *pian* or chapters from this block of "Essays" are fully identified by both *pian* number and title in the Qing *Siku quanshu* 四庫全書. The extant edition thus provides the text of only fifty-three actual *pian*.

6. Graham, *Later Mohist Logic*, 65.

7. Graham, *Later Mohist Logic*, 68, and 68 n. 94. The Yu manuscript is collated by Wu Yujiang in *Mozhi jiaozhu*.

### The internal organization of the extant text

The following table shows the present organization of the *Mozi* text in terms of both *juan* and *pian*. I have indicated for each *pian* or chapter the number of lines figuring in the concordanced text:<sup>8</sup>

TABLE I

<i>Juan</i> I ("Epitomes")	<i>pian</i> 1	"Qinshi" 親士	21 lines
	2	"Xiushen" 脩身	16
	3	"Suoran" 所染	17
	4	"Fayi" 法儀	22
	5	"Qihuan" 七患	28
	6	"Ciguo" 辭過	40
	7	"Sanbian" 三辯	11
<i>Juan</i> Total: 155			
<i>Juan</i> II ("Essays")	8	"Shangxian" <i>shang</i> 尚賢上	26
	9	"Shangxian" <i>zhong</i> 尚賢中	74
	10	"Shangxian" <i>xia</i> 尚賢下	48
<i>Juan</i> Total: 148			
<i>Juan</i> III	11	"Shangtong" <i>shang</i> 尚同上	25
	12	"Shangtong" <i>zhong</i> 尚同中	76
	13	"Shangtong" <i>xia</i> 尚同下	60
<i>Juan</i> Total: 161			
<i>Juan</i> IV	14	"Jian'ai" <i>shang</i> 兼愛上	19
	15	"Jian'ai" <i>zhong</i> 兼愛中	42
	16	"Jian'ai" <i>xia</i> 兼愛下	86
<i>Juan</i> Total: 147			
<i>Juan</i> V	17	"Feigong" <i>shang</i> 非攻上	14
	18	"Feigong" <i>zhong</i> 非攻中	41
	19	"Feigong" <i>xia</i> 非攻下	64
<i>Juan</i> Total: 119			
<i>Juan</i> VI	20	"Jieyong" <i>shang</i> 節用上	20
	21	"Jieyong" <i>zhong</i> 節用中	19
	22	"Jieyong" <i>xia</i> 節用下	("missing")
	23	"Jiezang" <i>shang</i> 節葬上	("missing")
	24	"Jiezang" <i>zhong</i> 節葬中	("missing")
	25	"Jiezang" <i>xia</i> 節葬下	88
<i>Juan</i> Total: 127			
<i>Juan</i> VII	26	"Tianzhi" <i>shang</i> 天志上	44
	27	"Tianzhi" <i>zhong</i> 天志中	73
	28	"Tianzhi" <i>xia</i> 天志下	72
<i>Juan</i> Total: 189			
<i>Juan</i> VIII	29	"Minggui" <i>shang</i> 明鬼上	("missing")
	30	"Minggui" <i>zhong</i> 明鬼中	("missing")
	31	"Minggui" <i>xia</i> 明鬼下	107
	32	"Feiyue" <i>shang</i> 非樂上	49
<i>Juan</i> Total: 156			

8. See *Harvard-Yenching Institute Sinological Index Series. A Concordance to Mo Tzu* (1948; reprint: San Francisco: Chinese Materials Center, 1974).

TABLE I (cont.)

<i>Juan IX</i>	33	"Feiyue" <i>zhong</i> 非樂中	("missing")
	34	"Feiyue" <i>xia</i> 非樂下	("missing")
	35	"Feiming" <i>shang</i> 非命中	47
	36	"Feiming" <i>zhong</i> 非命中	31
	37	"Feiming" <i>xia</i> 非命下	46
	38	"Fei Ru" <i>shang</i> 非儒上	("missing")
	39	"Fei Ru" <i>xia</i> 非儒下	63
			<i>Juan Total:</i> 187
<i>Juan X</i> ("Logic")	40	"Jing" <i>shang</i> 經上	20
	41	"Jing" <i>xia</i> 經下	29
	42	"Jingshuo" <i>shang</i> 經說上	50
	43	"Jingshuo" <i>xia</i> 經說下	97
			<i>Juan Total:</i> 196
<i>Juan XI</i> ("Dialogues")	44	"Daqu" 大取	57
	45	"Xiaoqu" 小取	30
	46	"Gengzhu" 耕柱	68
			<i>Juan Total:</i> 155
<i>Juan XII</i>	47	"Guiyi" 貴義	55
	48	"Gongmeng" 公孟	87
			<i>Juan Total:</i> 142
<i>Juan XIII</i> ("Defense")	49	"Luwen" 魯問	97
	50	"Gongshu" 公輸	19
	51	(title lost)	(lost)
			<i>Juan Total:</i> 116
<i>Juan XIV</i>	52	"Bei chengmen" 備城門	104
	53	"Bei gaolin" 備高臨	12
	54	(title lost)	(lost)
	55	(title lost)	(lost)
	56	"Bei ti" 備梯	20
	57	(title lost)	(lost)
	58	"Bei shui" 備水	5
	59	(title lost)	(lost)
	60	(title lost)	(lost)
	61	"Bei tu" 備突	3
	62	"Bei xue" 備穴	44
	63	"Bei efu" 備娥傅	27
			<i>Juan Total:</i> 215
<i>Juan XV</i>	64	(title lost)	(lost)
	65	(title lost)	(lost)
	66	(title lost)	(lost)
	67	(title lost)	(lost)
	68	"Yingdici" 迎敵祠	23
	69	"Qizhi" 旗幟	19
	70	"Haoling" 號令	139
	71	"Zashou" 雜守	54
			<i>Juan Total:</i> 235

Among the “Essay” chapters, *juan* II to IX, the *juan* from which individual “Essay” chapters are listed as “missing” have the common characteristic of effecting mixed groupings. That is, whereas *juan* number II (“Shangxian” 尙賢), III (“Shangtong” 尙同), IV (“Jian’ai” 兼愛), V (“Feigong” 非攻), and VII (“Tianzhi” 天志) consist of all three chapters of a single triad, the lacunary *juan* contain surviving *pian* from at least two triads each: the surviving chapters from “Jieyong” and “Jieyang” are made to share *juan* VI, and the ones from “Minggui” and “Feiyue” share *juan* VIII.

Furthermore, *juan* VIII has the peculiarity of giving the text of the one surviving chapter from the “Feiyue” triad after the full citation of the three “Minggui” chapters, but one has to wait for *juan* IX to see mention of the two “Feiyue” chapters which are now lost. *Juan* IX is thus made to start off with the mention of the last two “Feiyue” chapters, both lost. Then it gives in succession the three extant texts from the “Feiming” triad, before closing with the mention of the first, lost, “Fei Ru” chapter and the full text of the second, surviving one.

Such spilling over of one identifiable whole onto an adjacent *juan* can be seen in two other places in the extant *Mozhi* text: the first case is where the first of the “Dialogue” chapters, “Gengzhu” 耕柱 (*pian* 46), appears in *juan* XI together with the very different material of “Logic chapters” 44 and 45 (these two now reconstructed by Graham to read as fragments from a document named “Expounding the canons” and the whole of another, “Names and objects”); and the second is where *juan* XIII, containing “Dialogue” chapters number 49 and 50, is expected to end with the ghost of chapter 51, a “Defense” chapter, left unlisted at the beginning of *juan* XIV.

I interpret the spilling over noted in the case of the “Essay” chapters as indicating that the loss of the *pian* now listed as missing occurred sometime before the text was transferred to silk between Later Han and Sui. But nothing would prevent us from considering with Graham the loss of those chapters as having already occurred by the time the Han bibliographers set themselves to work.<sup>9</sup> As chapter 50 of the *Han Feizi* 韓非子 shows, there was by late Warring States and early Han times an already well-established convention according to which the “Mohists” had from early on divided into three main branches or sects at odds with each other. It was the divergent textual traditions of these branches that the Han bibliographers may have tried to preserve when they arranged the surviving “Essays” into a consistent sequence of “Ten Theses” (ten

9. See Graham, *Divisions in Early Mohism*, 17.

triads of three chapters each), filling in the gaps as best they could, yet choosing to leave others blank.<sup>10</sup>

It must already have been clear to the Han bibliographers that the “Fei Ru” chapters, one of which is no longer extant, were not part of the more authoritative statements of doctrine. These chapters do not figure in the list of doctrines found enunciated in “Dialogue” chapter 49 “Luwen” 魯問, where the speaker is presented as being “Master” Mozi himself.<sup>11</sup>

### Past scholarly attention in the West

Scholarly attention has tended in recent years to focus on the two most technical parts of the *Mozi* text, which also happen to be the most corrupted: these are the already mentioned “Logic” and “Defense” chapters, which occupy, as we have seen, most of *juan* X and XI, on the one hand, and the whole of *juan* XIV and XV, on the other.

Angus Graham based his reconstitution of the “Logic” chapters largely on a careful counting of prospective numbers of characters to a slip in different versions of the text as may have existed at different stages in the history of transmission.<sup>12</sup> A more recent attempt by Robin Yates at a reconstitution of the badly fragmented “Defense” chapters also depends on the same sort of approach, an approach that privileges our consideration of the material condition of the text.<sup>13</sup>

10. The *Han Feizi* quote is given in Graham, *Divisions in Early Mohism*, 18.

11. The “Luwen” 49/61–64 citation lists the authoritative statements or “theses” in an order slightly different from the one we find in the block of “Essays” (say, AB, EF, IJ, GH, and CD). The names of the “theses” are identical except in the cases of “Tianzhi” and “Minggui,” where each one of these two titles is replaced in turn by one of the two compounded terms of the expression *zuntian/shigui* 尊天/事鬼 (“Honor Heaven and serve the spirits”) found used three times independently in the “Dialogue” chapters (at “Gongmeng” 48/27 and 82, as well as in “Luwen” 49/3), once in chapter 4 from the “Epitomes” (4/18, with a negative form given at 4/20), once in “Essay” chapter 9 (“Shangxian” *zhong* 9/55, with a negative form given at 9/58), once in “Essay” chapter 35 (“Feiming” *shang*, with two parallel negative forms given in chapter 31 “Minggui” at 31/84 and 89 respectively), and once in “Essay” chapter 26 (“Tianzhi” *shang* 26/25) albeit in a split form. (The parallel negative formula is given at 26/28). Forke, *Me Ti*, 3–5, gives several citations from ancient texts which show that the title of the “Minggui” chapter in particular was not well established.

12. See Graham, *Later Mohist Logic*, 87–110. Graham discussed the matter in somewhat more detail with regard to the transmitted text of the *Gongsun Longzi* 公孫龍子 in his “Two Dialogues in the ‘Kung-sun Lung tzu’,” *Asia Major* ns 11/2 (1965), 128–152, reprinted with some changes in A.C. Graham, *Studies in Chinese Philosophy and Philosophical Literature* (Singapore: IEAP, 1986), 167–192, under the title: “A First Reading of the ‘White Horse’.”

13. See Robin D.S. Yates, “The Mohists on Warfare: Technology, Technique, and



But the less technical and corrupted parts of the text, as I will try to show, are no less challenging. They occupy, for recapitulation: *juan* I, the “Epitomes” (seven relatively short *pian* totalling 155 lines in the Harvard-Yenching concordanced text); *juan* II to IX, the “Essay” chapters (twenty-three surviving *pian* out of the expected total of thirty for the triads, to which has to be added the one surviving *pian* out of the only two ever mentioned for “Fei Ru,” most of them at least two to three times longer than the average one found in *juan* I); and *juan* XII and XIII, as well as the last *pian* (number 46) from *juan* XI, the “Dialogue” chapters.

### Alfred Forke

The textual problems relating to these parts were not analysed with any serious care in a Western language until 1922 when the German scholar Alfred Forke (1867–1944) published the only full (or nearly full) translation we have of the text: due to their special difficulty, the “Defense” chapters were more often abstracted than actually translated by Forke.

Graham later judged Forke’s attempt at a full translation of the “Logic” chapters as premature.<sup>14</sup> Forke’s lack of sophistication in dealing with these chapters may have reflected the lack of maturity of Chinese studies generally or of sinology in the West in Forke’s time. But this relative lack of sophistication is in a way no less representative of what Chinese commentators did before him and are still very much in the habit of doing today when dealing with the text as a whole: a considerable amount of attention is devoted to the correction of aberrant graphs, but not enough to (to use Graham’s words here in the context of the text as a whole) “the grammar, the technical vocabulary, the recurring stock examples, the overall organization of the parts.”<sup>15</sup> Emendation has a built-in tendency to depend intimately on what one would like the text to be saying, whereas a text may at times have more to tell us in terms of its history, and ultimately make more historical sense, when left to tell its story in its own words.

Forke had a remarkable command of all the more important Qing commentaries, from the eighteenth century Bi Yuan 畢沅 (1730–1797) down to and including Sun Yirang 孫詒讓 (1848–1908), who of course

---

Justification,” *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 47/3 S (1979), 564–579 (“Thematic Issue: Studies in Classical Chinese Thought,” ed. by Henry Rosemont Jr. and Benjamin I. Schwartz).

14. Graham, *Later Mohist Logic*, xi, commenting on Forke, *Me Ti*.

15. Graham, *Later Mohist Logic*, xii.

collated and discussed most of his predecessors in his late nineteenth-century edition of the text. But, as Stephen Durrant has noted, Forke was also able to show considerable independence of judgment in his own emendations, more often than not reacting on the conservative side against many of Sun's more ostensibly radical choices.<sup>16</sup> It is on this count, certainly, that Forke may be said to tie in most closely to the more recent practices of Western sinology.

Forke's work is mostly known today for the simile he drew between the "Essay" chapters of the *Mozì* and the Christian Gospels. As in the case of Mark, he saw the shortest chapter within a triad (which most often happens to be the first, or *shang* 上 chapter) as the earliest and most free of what he called either "elaboration" or "paraphrase," and hence, as the closest to a postulated "Urtext."<sup>17</sup> Forke then attempted to reconstruct such an "Urtext" in what is certainly one of the most daring and original parts of his book.<sup>18</sup>

His reconstruction was generally based on the shortest chapter of each one of the ten triads when it was available. Some further passages from the longer chapters were also adopted into the "Urtext" when its "feel" seemed right, and fuller versions of closely related parallel passages as found in one of the two longer chapters were even at times adopted into the "Urtext" in replacement of the one which was found in the shortest. But what was taken to be "elaboration" and "paraphrase" was in all cases dropped.

Forke's search for an "Urtext" shows us what he felt to be more "authentic," and what he took to be mere "elaboration" and "paraphrase." But in the "Essay" chapters' notoriously repetitive use of both long and short formulae as well as of extended patterned sentences, it is often difficult to distinguish "elaboration" and "paraphrase" from what is not, since formulae and patterned sentences are found in all chapters, down to and including the shortest chapter in a triad. One might argue that traces of an "Urtext" might rather be sought at the point where the patterned sentences stop, giving way to a number of unpatterned sentences, often written in a relatively more archaic or archaizing style and non-standard vocabulary. Forke tended to adopt both kinds of textual situations into his "Urtext," rejecting only the more blatant "elaborations" or corrupted repetitions, and even those on grounds which are not always consistent and which could certainly be challenged.

Forke's intimate knowledge of the text of the *Mozì* was nevertheless very real, as can be seen from the many important textual parallels he

16. Durrant, "An Examination of Textual and Grammatical Problems," 136.

17. Forke, *Me Ti*, 21–24.

18. Forke, *Me Ti*, 123–158.

noted among chapters which do not all belong to a single triad. Textual notes appear in two places: once within his translation, and once again at the end of the passages he retained as constitutive of a postulated "Urtext" for each triad.<sup>19</sup> As is generally the case with Chinese commentators, though, one cannot quite escape the view that, in treating such textual parallels, Forke remained on the whole more attentive to the commonality of theme than to lexical identity.

### Stephen Durrant

Attention to linguistic form has characterized Western sinology since Forke's time. I am of course thinking of Bernhard Karlgren's (1889–1978) work on what he chose to call the different "dialects" of ancient Chinese texts. Karlgren was the first to draw our attention to the varying grammatical usages which can be found in them, and thus successfully contrasted the language of the *Zuo* "Commentary" (*Zuozhuan* 左傳) to that of the more standard "Lu" 魯 texts, such as the Confucian *Analects* and the *Mencius*.<sup>20</sup> Work of precisely this type has been done more recently on the less corrupted parts of the *Mozi* by Stephen Durrant.

Unavailable to Karlgren when he first began his studies, the sinological indexes which first made their appearance in the early 1930s have greatly contributed to the development of the type of statistical studies he helped to pioneer as a trained linguist. Durrant's interest was, like Karlgren's, primarily that of the grammarian; but as was already the case with the latter, the grammarian's interest is never quite separate from that of the historian. Both types of research may orient themselves towards such unanswered questions as: What distinct historical "layers" can be found within the *Mozi*? When were they originally composed?<sup>21</sup>

Durrant found the *Mozi* to be written in a language that is noticeably different from that of either one of Karlgren's two major literary "dialects," but warned us that this in itself does not tell us anything about its actual place of origin, as the "Essay" chapters in particular show traces of colloquialisms which were perhaps being deliberately avoided in the more conservative "Lu" or *Ru* 儒 texts. He further suggested that the "Dialogue" chapters, which use a literary form already well attested in both the major *Ru* texts from Lu, should be considered as later than the "Essays," even though he took the argumentative form characteristic of the "Essays" to be a later historical development: the

19. Forke, *Me Ti*, 123–158.

20. Karlgren, Bernhard, *On the Authenticity and Nature of the Tso Chuan*, Göteborgs Högskolas Årsskrift 23:3 (Göteborg: Elanders Boktryckeri Aktiebolag, 1926).

21. Durrant, "An Examination of Textual and Grammatical Problems," 2.

"Dialogue" chapters can be shown to incorporate a number of critical linguistic features which are otherwise commonly found together only in the later Zhou texts.<sup>22</sup>

Since the "Epitomes" in *juan* I are too short a sample to be meaningfully treated through statistical analysis, Durrant's most perceptive textual remarks ended up being primarily concerned with the block of "Essays." They deserve to be rather extensively quoted as they will serve both to set the tone and predict some of the more definitive results of Graham's later study.

The text, Durrant warned us, is clearly "not a linguistically homogeneous unit" since "a number of important grammatical features which occur regularly within the Essay chapters" are not to be found anywhere else in the text. "However, the picture is much more complicated than this, for within the Essay chapters themselves, there is a serious inconsistency in the distribution of certain key features."

"The most revealing of these inconsistencies" Durrant found to be "that of the relational words *hu* 乎 and *yu* 於. In certain Essays only *yu* 於 occurs while others show a mixture of *hu* and *yu*."<sup>23</sup> (The more archaic *yu* 于 is found much less frequently than either of the other two "relational words," its appearances being almost exclusively restricted to quotations from ancient documents such as the *Shi* 詩 and the *Shu* 書).

"In the pursuit of the earliest strata of *Mozhi*," Durrant further warned us, "we must beware of simply assuming, as many have done, that the *shang* 上, *zhong* 中, *xia* 下 chapter distinctions alone necessarily reflect the development and elaboration of Mohism, for the *hu*/*yu* distribution and that of other critical features do not always correspond to the cross-triad categories of *shang*, *zhong*, *xia* or to the individual triad blocks themselves." "Undoubtedly," Durrant was led to conclude, "a close comparison of the three chapters in each triad and their relationships to one another will be most revealing, but our data indicate that other chapter groupings than those suggested by the triad labels alone may be necessary."<sup>24</sup>

However, as Graham came to note at the beginning of his study, "a slip in overlooking cases of the particle in chapter 16 ["*Jian'ai*" *xia*] prevented [Durrant] from recognizing that *hu* always clusters in a single chapter of a triad."<sup>25</sup> Thus diversifying his criteria to include "other

22. Durrant, "An Examination of Textual and Grammatical Problems," 317–318.

23. Durrant, "An Examination of Textual and Grammatical Problems," 315–316.

24. Durrant, "An Examination of Textual and Grammatical Problems," 317–318.

25. Graham, *Divisions in Early Mohism*, 2. This supposes that one accepts Graham's laying aside of the three parallel instances of *hu* clustered in a short corrupted passage found towards the beginning of chapter 8 ("Shangxian" *shang* 尚賢上 at 8/7).

words or word-combinations," set formulae and slightly more extended passages or patterned sentences such as the ones which serve to introduce or conclude individual chapters, Graham ended up positively identifying a total of three "series," which, as Durrant had warned, indeed do not correspond in all cases to the ones respectively labeled *shang*, *zhong*, and *xia* in the transmitted text.

### Angus Graham

One of the most important results of Graham's work was to show that at least two out of the twenty-three triad chapters now extant should not count as members of the original triads at all since they do not respond to any of the developed criteria. Because these chapters (numbers 14 and 20, "Jian'ai" *shang* and "Jieyong" *shang* respectively) tend to resemble in both style and length chapter 4 ("Fayi" 法儀) from the block of "Epitomes," Graham treated them as mere "digests" of a kind "[i]t is reasonable to suppose that the Mohist school would have a use for" as "short but complete summaries" of their doctrines, "without illustrative quotations or answers to objections, and almost without close parallelism with chapters in the same triads."<sup>26</sup> In addition, Graham treated chapter 17 from the "Feigong" triad, also a *shang* chapter in the transmitted text, as a fragment from the end of chapter 26 ("Tianzhi" *shang*). Chapters 26 and 28 ("Tianzhi" *shang* and *xia*), as members of the same triad, share a number of parallels, but chapter 26 breaks off precisely at the point where chapter 17 can be shown to run fairly parallel to the end of chapter 28.<sup>27</sup> Chapter 17 does not respond, though, anymore than the two "digests" just noted, to any of the criteria Graham developed to identify members of actual "series."

These three chapters, 14, 17, and 20, were entered as *shang* members of their respective triads by the Han bibliographers, according to Graham's account, because of their shortness (none of the three is more than twenty lines long in the concordanced text), a characteristic they share with the *shang* chapters from the two preceding triads, "Shangxian" and "Shangtong," which can otherwise be positively certified as members of one of Graham's new series. As a matter of fact, all seven members of this series, which Graham calls "Y" for short, seem to be consistently shorter than the other chapters in their respective triads. (The letter "Y" represents *yan* 言, itself an abbreviation of the full formula *ziMozi yanyue* 子墨子言曰 found consistently repeated in the so-named series).

26. Graham, *Divisions in Early Mohism*, 4.

27. Graham, *Divisions in Early Mohism*, 3–4. I will come back to this point below.

It should be noted, however, that the three aberrant chapters just mentioned found their way into the block of "Essays" not because of a loss of three successive Y chapters right after "Shangtong" ("Jian'ai," "Feigong," and "Jieyong" all have Y chapters according to Graham's new tabulation, although they are now found retrograded to the *zhong* position within the triads), but because of a postulated loss of at least three successive members of the third series, "J" in Graham's terminology. (The letter "J" comes from the Wade-Giles rendering of the *ran* 然 found in the *ran yue* 然曰 formula used to introduce quotations from the "Books of the Former Kings," *xianwang zhi shu* 先王之書, in the so-named series.) In the case of the first two triads, "Shangxian" and "Shangtong," it is the extant *xia* chapter that is included in Graham's J series. But other losses to the J series may likewise have affected the "Jiezang," "Minggui," and "Feiyue" triads.

As will be seen more clearly in Table II below, Graham's Y, "H" (for *hu*), and J series correspond to the Han bibliographers' *shang*, *zhong*, and *xia* divisions only in the cases of three triads: "Shangxian," "Shangtong," and "Tianzhi."<sup>28</sup> I have to emphasize that the block of "Essays" must have already been at least partially organized in terms of triads prior to the Han bibliographers' disordering of them, and that Graham's reconstruction of the three series in effect brings us back to that prior state of the text, which in turn gives its best support to the notion of three parallel yet divergent "sects" of "Mohism" as alluded to in chapter 50 of the *Han Feizi*. Indeed, Graham went on in his study to refine differences among these "sects" as varying in terms of ideological bent from "radical" or "purist" in the case of Y, to "moderate" or "compromising" in that of H, and to "reactionary" or more plainly "conservative" in the case of J.<sup>29</sup> But I shall not become too directly concerned here with semantic distinctions of that order.

As may be seen from Table II, the H chapters form the fullest surviving series. Its present form includes a total of nine out of a possible ten chapters, the one loss being chapter 22, marked as "missing" in the "Jieyong" triad. The H chapters are also generally the longest chapters within a triad, and have as a result been considered by Forke as the "latest," being fuller of both "elaboration" and "paraphrase."<sup>30</sup> By

28. A remark made in parentheses in Graham, *Divisions in Early Mohism*, 24, on the use of weapons reveals that Graham at one time considered chapter 20, finally treated as a "Digest," to be a possible candidate for inclusion in the J series.

29. See Graham, *Divisions in Early Mohism*, 18–28, and A.C. Graham, *Disputers of the Tao. Philosophical Argument in Ancient China* (La Salle, Ill.: Open Court, 1989), 36.

30. I include for comparison Forke's tabulation, as found in *Me Ti*, 23. It should be noted that Forke made a slight error in his tabulation: chapter 20, twenty lines long in

TABLE II

Title of triad: "Digests"/ Fragment	SX	ST	JA	FG	JY	JZ	TZ	MG	FY	FM
Y	8	11	15	18	21	x	26	x	?	35*
H	9	12	16	19	x	25	27	31	32	37
J	10	13					28		?	36*

NOTE: "x" indicates a chapter now marked as "missing" in the extant text. \* indicates that Graham considered chapters 35 and 36 as "mixed," i.e., as each including passages he attributed to the other, with chapter 35 also including in addition an extended fragment from the H series. Based on Graham, *Divisions in Early Mohism*, 17.

contrast, a mere four J chapters survive, pointing to a possible loss of six. As already noted, seven Y chapters survive, with a loss of three. These would have belonged to "Jiezang," "Minggui," and "Feiyue" respectively, that is, to the three triads for which, according to Graham's criteria, only the H chapter happens to survive.

### Complications in the establishment of the text of the "core chapters"

Not only is the list of chapters in the H series the longest, but it turns out that the criteria which can be used to identify these chapters are also the most numerous; the *hu* particle merely served to get Graham started on his enterprise. Among the other criteria he retained for the identification of H, one finds another particle, *ji* 即, as well as the compound *dangruo* 當若, which had already been considered as a possible criterion for series identification by Stephen Durrant in his more strictly grammatical study. Other criteria Graham retained were the more semantically charged "word-combinations": *wanmin* 萬民, *tiangui* 天鬼, and *guanfu* 官府. Series identification was then verified by Graham on the basis of the "introductory" and "concluding formulae" which are generally found at both ends of a chapter.<sup>31</sup>

the Harvard-Yenching concordanced text, should actually be placed below chapter 21, which is only nineteen lines long in the concordance. But the tabulation as it is allows for a better comparison with Graham's.

	SX	ST	JA	FG	JY	JZ	TZ	MG	FY	FM
"Q" ("Source")	8	11	14	17	20		26			36
"E" ("Elabor.")	10	13	15	18	21		28		32	37
"P" ("Paraph.")	9	12	16	19	(6)	25	27	31		35

It will be noticed that Forke chose to include the present chapter 6 from the "Epitomes" in the slot left vacant by "missing" chapter 22. I will have more to say on this below.

31. Graham, *Divisions in Early Mohism*, 10–12. As Graham noted, however, the longer the "word-combination," the greater the danger of textual corruption, and one



By increasing the gamut of criteria which can be effectively used for discriminating among different “versions” of a text, Graham’s approach marks an important improvement over both Karlgren’s and Durrant’s more restrictive methods. This is because a comparison of the Yinqueshan texts, for instance, with their transmitted versions shows that grammatical particles are precisely the features which tend to shift the most between different versions of what can only be taken as the same text.<sup>32</sup>

The choice of “words and word-combinations” as well as formulae and more extended sentences as criteria for determining group affiliations is nevertheless subject to basically the same rules as those which guide the use of grammatical particles: the only features that can be retained as criteria are those features which, by their statistical clustering in certain well-defined parts of the text, help us to distinguish those parts from others. Graham’s basic unit of comparison was the *pian*; and his main problem was to find out whether all the *pian* which are presently constitutive of the block of “Essays” could be made to fall into neat patterns of three. His very success in achieving this should not distract us from the fact that other patterns can be found, using different sets of criteria altogether.

Were one to choose any other grammatical particle, “word and word-combination,” formula or extended sentence for determining the different hands which may have gone into the composition of either whole *pian* or, more simply, isolated parts of such *pian*, the number of units covered in each case would be either too small or far too large for inclusion in any consistent three-part arrangement. Indeed, as I can tell from my own experience of the text, the significant unit would no longer be the individual *pian* at all, but the *ce* below that level. This can only mean that as one starts pursuing such further lexical marks, one will in fact be

---

has to be all the more strict about what he terms “verbal identity.” Even he could not quite respect his own rule, it seems, and instances of corruption he discounted as unmeaningful in his discrimination among parallel sentences or formulae found at both ends of a chapter within any one of his predefined series are not, in my view, in all cases very different from the ones found in cross-series parallels.

32. Durrant himself remarked on this point in an article Graham happened to stumble upon as he was finishing an article of his own on the uses of the particle *hu* in pre-Han texts: S.W. Durrant, “A Consideration of Differences in the Grammar of the Mo Tzu ‘Essays’ and ‘Dialogues,’” *Monumenta Serica* 33 (1977–1978), 249–250. The reference to this article by Durrant and to A.C. Graham, “A Post-Verbal Aspectual Particle in Classical Chinese: the Supposed Preposition HU (乎),” *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 41/2 (1978) is given in Graham, *Divisions in Early Mohism*, 2 n. 5.



reaching in time back before the stage at which Graham's three "documents" or series of chapters first achieved their final form.

As such new and earlier stages are effectively reached, the question may arise as to how many "schools" of Mohism might have existed before the advent of Graham's three "sects." But more important than that are the questions of what kinds of texts the early Mohists may have primarily drawn from, and what specific forms the documents they themselves produced within their schools took. Such "primary texts" and "internal documents" were undoubtedly much more numerous than the simple listing of the Y, H, and J "documents" would lead us to suppose.<sup>33</sup> We are clearly dealing with much more than an "oral tradition" here.<sup>34</sup>

Forke may have been closer to the point when he kept looking for an "Urtext" for each one of the ten triads. But even that purpose seems too narrow, for it appears to me that there were several "Urtexts" at different stages, and thus, perhaps, that there was no definitive single "Urtext" at all, since all these documents would have borrowed from each other from very early on. Anything resembling a single "Urtext," then, might well have consisted of nothing more than the quotations from the *Shu* and *Shi* we still find scattered within the present chapters, with the addition of passages from such less authoritative texts as were later compiled into the *Guoyu* 國語.

Taking Forke's search for an "Urtext" more seriously than Graham did, then, but equipped this time with Graham's method of tracking down all forms of repetition which might be taken as a sign of common ancestry, I have tried to remain attentive in my own work even to those looser forms of repetition where close but inexact parallel passages are involved, as these might also tell us something about common lineage at the level of the different *ce* or "passages" of which the present *pian* seem to be composed. Moreover, I have considered those passages within chapters where a minimal amount of shared vocabulary is all one now may have to go on to judge further possible textual affiliations. The considerations I evoked at the beginning of this paper regarding the process of composition of early texts before they became fully "canonized" as *pian* were thus directly inspired by the type of preliminary work I have just described.

---

33. The word "document" is used by Graham at the end of his study to mean the conflation of the various chapters in a series; see Graham, *Divisions in Early Mohism*, 28.

34. Graham, *Divisions in Early Mohism*, 1, and 28.

### The grammatical particles “*hu*” 乎 and “*ji*” 即

In Table III, I reproduce the data from Graham’s tables of lexical criteria, limiting myself to the H series.

TABLE III

	Chapter 9	12	16	19	25	27	31	32	37	(35)
<i>hu</i> <sup>a</sup> 乎	15	21	8	6	21	13	15	13	21	
<i>ji</i> 即		2	42	1	4			17		
<i>dangruo</i> 當若	1	2	1	2	1	2	1		1	
<i>wanmin</i> 萬民	11	14	7	4	1	5	4	6	3	2
<i>tiangui</i> <sup>b</sup> 天鬼	4	6		1		4	1	1	2	2
<i>guanfu</i> 官府	2			1			3	2	4	2

<sup>a</sup> three instances of *hu* are also to be found clustered in chapter 8 of the Y series in a passage (found at 8/7) which may have strayed in from somewhere in the H series.

<sup>b</sup> *tiangui* is also found twice in the J series: at 10/48 and 36/4.

It will be seen that, with the exceptions of *hu* and *wanmin*, a given criterion is not necessarily to be found in all chapters of this series. Indeed, only a single chapter includes at least one instance of all six criteria listed here: this is chapter 19 from the “Feigong” triad (“Feigong” *xia*). *Wanmin* actually works better as a criterion than *hu*, for whereas *hu* may be found in chapters from other series, such as chapter 8 Y and 11 Y (11/5 has a single instance of it, written in the extant text in the old form 摩), this is not the case with *wanmin*. Besides, *hu* is not to be found in the passage from chapter 35 Y (35/18–33 or 35/18–35 depending on which of Graham’s treatments one relies on),<sup>35</sup> which Graham convincingly identified as H, whereas *wanmin* is.

The uneven distribution of the criteria may be taken as a sign that they all have a very different history. That they might all serve, nevertheless, as positive criteria for the identification of H tells us that, whatever their individual history may be, it is in fact part of the history of the “sect” Graham saw as primarily responsible for the composition and subsequent immediate transmission of the “document” known as H.

Let us have a closer look at some of these criteria. I will begin with the grammatical particles *hu* and *ji*. As Durrant had already noted, some of

35. Compare Graham, *Divisions in Early Mohism*, 7, where the reference given at the top of the page is, I think, more correctly, 35/18–35; and *ibid.* 14–17, where the reference is consistently given as 35/18–33. The confusion comes from Graham’s treatment of the matter in the last paragraph on page 14: 35/28–31 and 35/31–34 are two strictly parallel blocks, both carrying the H mark *guanfu*, the only difference coming from a shift from positive to negative and negative to positive signs. 35/34–35 does not carry any series criteria, but it could itself be treated as coming from H since it has correspondences with chapter 16 H (at 16/3 and 16/84).

the grammatical particles found within the “Essay” chapters seem to be used in less than their full grammatical functions in the text.<sup>36</sup> This is precisely the case with both *hu* and *ji*, which are found, where close parallels can be checked, in places where *yu* 於 and *ze* 則 respectively are otherwise found, whether within the H series itself (in the cases of both *hu/yu* and *ji/ze*) or in Y and J (only in the case of *hu/yu*).

Let us compare for example the two following occurrences of a parallel passage:

11/24 Y 此天之所以罰百姓之不上同於天者也  
12/33 H 將以罰下人之不尙同乎天者也

These are simply the punishments Heaven sent down upon the people (the inferiors) for not identifying themselves with Heaven.<sup>37</sup>

Whereas the frequency of *hu* in individual chapters varies between highs of twenty-one instances in chapters 12 H and 25 H and lows of eight and six respectively for chapters 16 H and 19 H (with an overall mean situated between thirteen and fifteen), instances of *ji* vary much more greatly among chapters: chapter 16 H contains forty-two instances and chapter 32 H seventeen, while chapter 25 H has only four instances, three of which are clustered in a corrupt passage with two partial parallels in chapter 16 H.

25/9 H 二子者。言則相非。行即相反。  
25/10 H 言即相非。行即相反  
16/28,41 H 二 者。言 相非而行 相反。

The words of these two are directly opposed, as are also their actions.<sup>38</sup>

Other instances of it are scarce: there are two in chapter 12 H, and a single one in chapter 19 H. The two instances of *ji* in chapter 12 H are

36. Durrant, “An Examination of Textual and Grammatical Problems,” 167–177.

37. Burton Watson, transl., *Mo Tzu. Basic Writings* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1963), 37. I basically follow Watson’s rendering of the phrase as it is found in chapter 11 Y since I take the chapter 12 H parallel to be partially corrupted: as we will see later, the whole passage in chapter 12 H is actually badly damaged and shows traces of interference with parallel passages found in another H chapter, chapter 27, “Tianzhi” *zhong*, at 27/28–30 and 27/9 respectively. Other examples of *hu/yu* inversions are to be found at: 9/49 H paralleling 10/24 J; 9/73 H paralleling 12/68 H; 37/8 H paralleling 35/11 Y; and 32/8 H paralleling 6/30 from the “Epitomes.”

38. Compare Watson, *Mo Tzu*, 66. See also Mei Yi-pao, *The Ethical and Political Works of Motse* (London: Probsthain, 1929; reprint: Westport, Conn.: Hyperion Press, 1973), 124. 16/41 has *jun* 君 here; the *Daozang* text has a corresponding blank in 16/28, which has been filled out by Sun Yirang with *shi* 士 to accord with the context.

examples of substitution in consecutive sentences, such as was the case in the passage just quoted from chapter 25 H. First, 12/66–68 has a set of standard phrases built on the model:

助之 X X 者 衆 。 則 …

When numerous are those who help one's X X, then . . . .<sup>39</sup>

The phrase is repeated four times, three times with *ze*, the last one with *ji*.

Second, the phrase *ze ci yan* 則此言 (this then says . . . ), which Graham retained as a form typical of H when a quotation from a “Book of the Former Kings” is followed by a comment or paraphrase, occurs three times as such in chapter 12 H (at 12/46, 50, and 70), but once (at 12/73) in the form *ji ci yan*, which is otherwise the regular practice of chapter 16 H only. (See 16/51, 58, and 71).

Cross-chapter shifts can be seen from a comparison of parallel passages found in chapter 27 H (27/56) and 32 H (32/14), or 25 H (25/25) and once again 32 H (32/38). I quote only the first of these two examples.

27/56 H 處大國則攻小國。處大家則亂小家。

32/14 H 有大國即攻小國。有大家即伐小家。

Because of one's position in a large state, one attacks smaller states; because of one's position in a grand family, one creates disorder among lesser ones.<sup>40</sup>

32/14 has (*jin* 今) *you* 有 instead of *chu* 處, and *ji* instead of *ze*. (It also has *fa* 伐 in lieu of *luan* 亂). Chapter 26 Y also uses the phrase in parallel to chapter 27 H, but it is there given without either *ze* or *ji*. (See 26/39).

Although *ji* appears only in the H series, it is not characteristic of the series as a whole, for the H chapters generally use *ze* instead. Indeed, *ji* is characteristic of only two individual chapters, 16 H and 32 H, within the series, being used in these two chapters almost to the exclusion of *ze*. The exceptions do not invalidate the consistency of its use. *Ze* is used twice in chapter 16 H, but in a passage (16/27) which has an exact parallel elsewhere in the chapter (16/40) where *ji* is used instead. The systematic replacement of *ze* by *ji* also affects the grammatical compound *ranze* 然則, which is consistently rendered as *ranji*. The same may be said for chapter 32 H, except that in that chapter the two clustered instances of *ze* are both part of the compound *ranze* (see 32/11).

Such a striking consistency in the marking of these two chapters is reminiscent of what happens to a text when a taboo character is to be

39. Compare Mei, *The Works of Motse*, 67–68.

40. Compare Watson, *Mo Tzu*, 91, and Mei, *The Works of Motse*, 148.

respected, but I know of no such character as *ze* ever being tabooed in ancient China. The marking is deliberate, and I do not think it has anything to do with a simple “dialectical” variation. The consistency could be attributed to an attempt at formalization comparable to the one Graham saw affecting the use of grammatical particles generally within the “Logic” chapters; but again, I do not see anything “technical” in the consistent use of *ji* in chapters 16 H and 32 H.<sup>41</sup> Rather, the marking might simply be read as an act of “appropriation” of the chapters in question by some sub-group within the “sect” Graham saw as responsible for the definitive arrangement of the H series or “document” in its present form.

Now, Graham’s criteria are not consistently distributed within the H corpus or even, most of the time, within an individual chapter. It is only in the case of *ji* that a given marking can be seen to affect most consistently the whole text of a chapter. I take this to mean that the two chapters in question, numbers 16 H and 32 H, were marked with *ji* relatively late in the history of their individual transmissions. The sub-group most directly responsible for their late marking was never dominant, however, and was not itself responsible for the ultimate transmission of the whole corpus of H texts.

Such consistency is never attained in the case of *hu*, since, as Durrant had already noted, all H chapters concurrently have a fairly evenly distributed number of instances of *yu*.<sup>42</sup> Its more uneven distribution within a chapter might, however, indicate that the isolated parts of a given chapter containing clustered instances of *hu* might originate in an individual document which was at one time consistently marked by *hu* in the manner present chapters 16 H and 32 H were marked by *ji*.

### ***Wanmin*, “the people,” and *tiangui*, “Heaven and the spirits”**

The problem of *hu* would seem to repeat itself in the cases of the two “word combinations” *wanmin* and *tiangui*. These three criteria, however, were not necessarily part of the same postulated “school document” from which individual bits and pieces were either quoted or detached at any one time before the *pian* we know acquired their final form. They most definitely entered the present *pian* separately.

*Wanmin*, “the people,” can be shown from parallel passages to be used where *baixing* 百姓, also “the people,” otherwise occurs. Other alternatives to *baixing* include *zhong* 衆, “the multitude,” and *xiaren* 下

41. Graham, *Later Mohist Logic*, 15–25.

42. Durrant, “An Examination of Textual and Grammatical Problems,” 315–316.

人, “the people below” or “the inferiors,” as in the quotes given above of the contrasted parallels between 11/24 Y and 12/33 H regarding the uses of *yu* and *hu*. *Wanmin* is used exclusively in H, and all H chapters carry at least one instance of it. But when contrasted to *baixing*, it appears to be exclusively used in only five of the nine H chapters, three of the remaining four chapters having actually more instances of *baixing* than of *wanmin*.

TABLE IV: Number of Instances of Wanmin vs. Baixing

Chapters:	9	12	16	19	25	27	31	32	37	(35)
										(35/18–35H)
<i>wanmin</i>	11	14	7	4	1	5	4	6	3	2
<i>baixing</i>				7	3	1			3	9

The shift from *baixing* to *wanmin* generally occurs within sentences of the type I take to be the natural production of all the schools or “sects” of Mohism: these are the well-structured and highly patterned sentences which most clearly serve to distinguish the block of “Essay” chapters from the other blocks of chapters found within the corpus as a whole.

The situation is somewhat different in the case of *tiangui* “Heaven and the spirits.” *Tiangui* also often occurs within such highly patterned structures. However, there are places in the text where we encounter an expression which would appear to be the *tiangui* compound’s predecessor. As the following parallel passages show, *tiangui* (“Heaven and the spirits”) appears in lieu of the longer and somewhat more archaic form *shangdi guishen* 上帝鬼神, “the Lord(s) on High and the spirits and ghosts,” which is itself independently used whether in H or in J alternatively with the slightly longer expression *shangdi shan chuan guishen* 上帝山川鬼神, “the Lord(s) on High and the spirits and ghosts from the mountains and rivers.”

26/19 Y 潔 [爲粢] 盛酒醴以 祭祀 上帝 鬼神。

28/20 J 粢 爲粢 盛酒醴以 [...] 祭祀 上帝山川鬼神。

27/9, 17 H 潔 爲酒 醴粢盛以 祭祀天鬼。

... prepare clean offerings of wine and millet in order to sacrifice to Heaven and the spirits / to the Lord(s) on High and to the spirits and ghosts.

The language of this expression is more archaic than that generally used in the highly patterned sets alluded to above. Passages of this nature would seem to derive from older documents, either from the kind found quoted in a more formal fashion elsewhere in the text (with the addition

of the “quotation” formulae Graham defined more clearly in his study),<sup>43</sup> or such less authoritative texts as later found their way into the present *Guoyu* collection. They may have been quoted each time directly from long standing documents, but I take it that they may have existed within the Mohist “schools” as texts already reduced to *ce*, that is, as choices of set phrases carrying enough of a “classical” connotation to come in handy as a “learned” reference when developing an argument.

The two compounds *wanmin* and *tiangui* do often appear within closely related passages. They are, however, never directly compounded together. In the few instances when one of the two “word-combinations” is compounded with another, the direct companion of *tiangui* is *baixing* and not *wanmin*:

19/7 H 天鬼百姓之利

. . . the benefit of Heaven and the spirits and of the people.<sup>44</sup>

The closest one gets to a juxtaposition of *tiangui* and *wanmin* is in phrases where the *tiangui* compound is split to form the new phrase *zuntian shigui*, which I have already mentioned above when discussing the titles of the triads as they are found listed in “Dialogue” chapter 49 (“Luwen”) at 49/63. Chapter 9/55 H thus has:

尊天事鬼愛利萬民

Honor Heaven and serve the spirits, love and benefit the people,

with the negative form of the formula given in parallel below it at 9/58.

### *Guanfu*, “government bureaus”

*Guanfu* is at times found in passages close to ones containing either *wanmin* or *tiangui* or both. Whereas *tiangui* can be shown to have developed out of an older and more archaically phrased expression, it is more difficult to determine what more archaic expression *guanfu* might have been designed to replace.<sup>45</sup> What one finds instead is that it is used in a consistent and archaically phrased document that is wholly “internal” to H. All instances of *guanfu* in chapters 9 H, 19 H, 32 H, and 37 H (a

43. Graham, *Divisions in Early Mohism*, 8–10.

44. One of the two occurrences of *tiangui* in J is parallel: see 10/48 J. The compounding of the two forms is also found repeated twice in the “Dialogues” within two closely parallel sentences clustered at 47/16.

45. As one can see from the text of the quotations given below, the compound *guanfu*, “government bureaus,” once replaces in chapter 37 H (37/33) the full phrase *canglin fuku* 倉廩庫府 (“granaries and treasuries”), which is given in parallel in chapter 32 H at 32/36. This shift is, however, exceptional.

total of eleven out of the sixteen instances in the series as a whole) are found to originate in this document, which is “quoted” or “reused” in slightly different ways in each one of the four chapters.

Graham remarked at the beginning of his study that “in more than one case a chapter parallels the whole of another chapter (ch. 11 = 12/1–41; ch. 36 = 37/1–29) but then continues with entirely new material introduced by a new ‘Mo-tzu said’ (ch. 12/41–76; 37/29–46), suggesting that the oral tradition expanded and diverged within the Mohist sects.”<sup>46</sup> Neither Graham nor Forke before him noticed that where present chapter 37 H “continues,” in Graham’s words, “with entirely new material,” it actually does so in close parallel to chapter 32 H (37/30–41 = 32/34–42). This rather extensive reiterated passage is itself made up in each of the two chapters of two structurally parallel parts, the first one setting out matters in the affirmative mode (Part A), the second (which is itself articulated in chapter 37 H in a form which further subdivides it into two parallel components, running roughly 37/38–39 and 37/39–41) echoing it in the negative mode (Part B). The affirmative portion in both chapters 32 H and 37 H has a somewhat more limited and fragmented parallel in present chapter 9 H (9/8–10). (This parallel between chapters 9 and 32 was, on the other hand, duly recorded by Forke). The negative portion has a somewhat fragmented but still close parallel in chapter 25 H (25/25–27).

#### Part A:

9/8 H 賢者之治國者也。蚤朝晏退。聽獄治政。

32/34 H 王公大人 蚤朝晏退。聽獄治政。

37/30 H 今也王公大人之所以早朝晏退。聽獄治政。

9/8 H 是以國家治而刑法正。

32/34 H 此其分事也。

37/30 H 終朝均分，而不敢息怠倦者何也。

37/31 H 曰。彼以爲強必治。不強必亂。

37/31 H 強必寧。不強必危。故不敢怠倦。

9/8 H 賢者之長官也。夜寢夙興。

32/35 H 士君子 竭股肱之力。宣其思慮之智。

37/32 H 今也卿大夫之所以竭股肱之力。殫其思慮之知。

9/8 H 收斂關市山林澤梁之利。

32/35 H 內治官府。外收斂關市山林澤梁之利。

37/32 H 內治官府。外 斂關市山林澤梁之利。

46. Graham, *Divisions in Early Mohism*, 1.



- 9/8 H 以實官府。是以官府實而財不散。  
 32/35 H 以實倉廩府庫。此其分事也。  
 37/32 H 以實官府。而不敢怠倦者何也。  
 37/33 H 曰。彼以爲強必貴。不強必賤。  
 37/34 H 強必榮。不強必辱。故不敢怠倦。  
 9/9 H 賢者之治邑也。蚤出暮入。耕稼樹藝。  
 32/36 H 農夫 蚤出暮入。耕稼樹藝。  
 37/34 H 今也農夫之所以 蚤出暮入。強乎耕稼樹藝。  
 9/9 H 聚菽粟。是以菽粟多而民足乎食。  
 32/36 H 多聚升粟。此其分事也。  
 37/34 H 多聚升粟。而不敢怠倦者何也。  
 37/35 H 曰。彼以爲強必富。不強必貧。  
 37/35 H 強必飽。不強必飢。故不敢怠倦。  
 9/9 H [夜寢夙興: see above at 9/8 H]  
 32/37 H 婦人 夙興夜寢。紡績織紉。  
 37/36 H 今也婦人之所以夙興夜寢。強乎紡績織紉。  
 32/37 H 多治麻絲葛緒 細布縵。[etc. . .]  
 37/36 H 多治麻紵葛緒。捫布縵。[etc. . .]  
 37/37 H 曰。彼以爲強必富。不強必貧。  
 37/37 H 強必煖。不強必寒。故不敢怠倦。  
 9/10 H 故國家治則刑法正。官府實則萬民富。

### Part B:

- 25/25 H 使 王公大人 行此。  
 32/37 H 今惟母在乎王公大人 說 樂而 聽之。  
 37/38 H 今雖母在乎王公大人。黃若信有命而致行之。  
 25/25 H 則必不能蚤朝。  
 32/37 H 即必不能蚤朝晏退。聽獄治政。是故國家亂而社稷危矣。  
 37/38 H 則必怠乎 聽獄治政矣。  
 25/25 H 五官六府。辟草木。  
 實倉廩。  
 32/38 H 今惟母在乎士君子說樂而聽之。即必不能竭股肱之力。  
 。置其思慮之智。內治官府。外收斂關市山林澤梁之利。以實倉廩府庫。是故倉廩府庫不實。  
 37/39 H 卿大夫 必 怠乎 治官府矣。  
 25/26 H 使農夫 行此。則必不能蚤出夜入。  
 32/40 H 今惟母在乎農夫說樂而聽之。即必不能蚤出暮入。  
 37/39 H 農夫 必怠乎

25/26 H 耕稼樹藝。

32/40 H 耕稼樹藝。 多聚升粟。 [...] 不足。

37/39 H 耕稼樹藝矣。

25/27 H            使百工            行此。則必不能修舟車爲器皿  
矣。

25/27 H            使 婦人            行此。則必不能夙興夜寢。

32/41 H 今惟母在乎婦人說樂而聽之。即不必 夙興夜寢。

37/39 H            婦人            必怠乎

25/27 H 紡績織紵。            細 [...]

32/41 H 紡績織紵。 多治麻絲葛緒細布縵。是故布縵不興。

37/39 H 紡績織紵矣。

37/39 H 王公大人怠乎聽獄治政。卿大夫怠乎治官府。

37/40 H 農夫        怠乎耕稼樹藝。 婦人怠乎紡績織紵。

37/39 H 則我以爲天下必亂矣。

37/40 H 則我以爲天下衣食之財將必不足矣。

Since the chapter 37 H “version” of this “internal” document is fuller of “elaboration” and thus undoubtedly the latest, for the translation I will limit myself to quoting Watson’s for chapter 32 H, with only a few changes:<sup>47</sup>

**Part A.** The rulers and ministers appear at court early and retire late, hearing lawsuits and attending to affairs of government. This is their allotted task.

The gentlemen exhaust the strength of their limbs and employ to the fullest the wisdom of their minds, directing government bureaus within and collecting taxes on the barriers and markets and on the resources of the hill, forests, lakes, and fish weirs abroad, so that the granaries and treasuries will be full. This is their allotted task.

The farmers leave home early and return late, sowing seed, planting trees, and gathering large crops of vegetables and grain. This is their allotted task.

Women rise early and go to bed late, spinning, weaving, producing large quantities of hemp, silk, and other fibers, and preparing cloth. This is their allotted task.

**Part B.** Now if those who occupy the position of rulers and ministers are fond of music and spend their time listening to it, then they

47. See Watson, *Mo Tzu*, 114–115. Compare Mei, *The Works of Motse*, 179. For the versions in chapters 9 H and 25 H, see further Watson, 23–24 and 68; Mei, 37 and 126. The chapter 37 H version may be checked in Mei, 198–199.

will not be able to appear at court early and retire late, or hear lawsuits and attend to affairs of government, and as a result the state will fall into disorder and its altars of the soil and grain will be in danger.

If those who occupy the position of gentlemen are fond of music and spend their time listening to it, then they will be unable to exhaust the strength of their limbs and employ to the fullest the wisdom of their minds in directing government bureaus within and collecting taxes on the barriers and markets and on the resources of the hills, forests, lakes, and fish weirs abroad, in order to fill the granaries and treasuries, and as a result the granaries and treasuries will not be filled.

If those who occupy the position of farmers are fond of music and spend their time listening to it, then they will be unable to leave home early and return late, sowing seed, planting trees, and gathering large crops of vegetables and grain, and as a result there will be a lack of vegetables and grain.<sup>48</sup>

If women are fond of music and spend their time listening to it, then they will be unable to rise early and go to bed late, spinning, weaving, producing large quantities of hemp, silk, and other fibers, and preparing cloth, and as a result there will not be enough cloth.

We should also note that what is left of the document in chapter 9 H retains phrases (such as *guojia zhi* 國家治 at 9/8, *guanfu shi* 官府實 at 9/9, etc.) which have negative parallels in Part B of both 32 H and 37 H. The affirmative counterparts of these phrases seem, however, to be now lost from Part A of these two chapters. Chapter 9 H thus does not derive directly from the present texts of chapters 32 H and 37 H, but must be feeding on some common predecessor.

Chapter 19, also H ("Feigong" *xia*), has a shorter version of Part B at 19/23–24. It comes right after a short patterned set it has in common with "Digest" chapter 20, the present *shang* chapter from the "Jieyong" triad. The patterned set in chapter 20 is itself surrounded by two parallels it shares with another "Feigong" chapter, chapter 18 Y ("Feigong" *zhong*: 20/15 = 18/4, and 20/17 = 18/7).

The beginning of line 20/15 in "Jieyong" *shang* has a short phrase with a close parallel found repeated in "Feiyue" chapter 32 H at 32/8 (twice) and 32/17. And this phrase has other parallels which are to be found, not within any other chapter from the "Essays," but in chapter 6 ("Cigu") from the "Epitomes." Chapter 32 H has other scattered parallels in

48. Chapter 25 H here has a passage original to it which deals with artisans.

common with “Epitome” chapter 6, which, as we will see more clearly below, has many other affinities both with the “Essay” chapters generally and more precisely with both the general theme and the text of “Jieyong” chapter 21 Y in particular. Chapters 6, 21 Y, 25 H, and 32 H all share some basic textual as well as thematic affinities which will lead us to treat them together as falling under a general “Jieyong” (“Moderation in Expenditures”) problematique. As we do so, it should be remembered that where the general theme of the “Jieyong” triad joins that of the document “internal” to the H series we have just studied, it also joins what seems to be an integral part of the “Feigong” (“Against Offensive Warfare”) problematique as well.<sup>49</sup>

**The “Moderation in Expenditures” problematique: Formulae and extended sentences common to chapters 6 (from the “Epitomes”), 21 Y, 25 H (“Moderation in Funerals”), and 32 H (“Against Music”)**

The different “markings” which now serve to segregate Graham’s H series from the other two have a complex history. Graham’s three series or “documents” did not attain their present form all at once, but were rather the product of a long evolution, the various stages of which it is left for us to try and reconstruct. The process of “development and divergence” which Graham alluded to in the conclusion to his study was clearly not restricted to what might have gone on “orally” within the three supposed “sects” as he stressed,<sup>50</sup> but was effectively based, as Forke’s search for an “Urtext” already implied, upon quite extensive “written” material. I see this material as having been selectively incorporated at different stages of transmission, by members of a number of Mohist “schools” that must have been in existence prior to the three “sects” during late Zhou and Warring States times, into “school” documents of varying shapes and purposes.

If Graham’s notion of a “digest” is applied to chapters such as numbers 14 (“Jian’ai” *shang*) and 20 (“Jieyong” *shang*) in the present block of “Essays,” it appears that such chapters, where not a single series mark

49. The textual affinities between “Feiming” chapter 37 H and “Feiyue” chapter 32 H by contrast are more ancillary. The “Feiming” texts themselves do share with “Feigong” chapter 19 H what appears to be a common but otherwise exclusive concern for the not inconsequential notion of the “mandate of Heaven” or *tianming* 天命, but they do not otherwise directly connect with the “Jieyong” problematique. The bound form of the compound *tianming* appears at 19/33, 41, 42, 44 H as well as at 37/23, 24 H; 36/25, 29 J; and 35/40 Y. The unbound form is given at 19/37, 38, 39, 41 H as well as at 36/28, 30 J; and 35/45 Y. The compound is also found at 39/10 “Fei Ru.”

50. Graham, *Divisions in Early Mohism*, 28.

can be found, might have grown out of the text of the “Essays” as we now have them. As Graham himself noted, chapter 4 (“Fayi” 法儀) from the “Epitomes” is comparable with both of these chapters: just as chapters 14 and 20 share the overriding thematic concerns of the other chapters in their respective triads, chapter 4 likewise shares its general theme with chapters 26 Y to 28 J in the “Tianzhi” (“The Will of Heaven”) triad.

Attention to pattern is dominant in all three “Digest” chapters (4, 14, and 20), reaching its seeming perfection in chapter 14. Patterned sentences tend to be specific in their actual form to the chapter in which they occur predominantly. There are notable exceptions to this rule within the “Essay” chapters themselves, but such mutual “pollution” is most obviously absent from the “digests.” Isolated interferences do exist here and there: I have already noted the parallels between chapter 20 and chapters 18 Y and 19 H from the “Feigong” triad; others occur between chapter 4 and chapter 26 Y ( $4/14, 13 = 26/32-33$ ), as well as between chapter 14 and chapter 18 Y ( $14/2 = 18/18$ ).

Other chapters from the “Epitomes” do not quite fit this characterization. They tend to be much poorer in patterned sentences, with the striking exception of chapter 6. This chapter is more than twice as long as any other chapter from the block of “Epitomes,” and it stylistically resembles the chapters which are now part of the block of “Essays,” with their telltale mixture of patterned sentences set in a fairly standard vocabulary together with stretches of unpatterned text, often filled, by way of contrast, with archaic sounding phrases. Forke, as a matter of fact, cited chapter 6 in his attempted reconstruction of an “Urtext” for “Jieyong” in conjunction with citations from both chapters 20 and 21 Y, and a recent Chinese commentator, Wang Huanbiao 王煥鑣 has even gone so far as to transpose it whole to the block of “Essays,” placing it under the heading of “missing” chapter 22, which would be H if Graham’s proposed arrangement were to be followed.<sup>51</sup> But here again, because it is unmarked, chapter 6 cannot in its present state be confidently ascribed to any one of Graham’s series, nor, consequently, can it be attributed to any one of the three “sects” he saw as responsible for their transmission. This is rather strange in a sense since the beginning of chapter 6, in its present state, shows traces of considerable interference from the end of chapter 21 Y.

51. See Forke, *Me Ti*, 24 and 136–138; and Wang Huanbiao 王煥鑣, *Mozi jiaoshi* 墨子校釋 (Hangzhou: Zhejiang Wenyi chubanshe, 1984), 176–186.

6/1 子墨子曰。<sup>52</sup>

6/1 古之民。未知爲宮[室]時。

21/15 Y 古者人之始生。未有宮室之時。

21/15 Y 聖王慮之。以爲

21/15 Y 曰。冬可以辟風寒。

6/1 就陵阜而居。穴而處。

21/15 Y 因陵丘堀穴而處焉。

21/15 Y 堀穴。

6/1 下潤濕傷民。

21/15 Y 逮夏。下潤溼。

21/16 Y 上熏烝。恐傷民之氣。

6/1 故聖王作爲宮室。

21/16 Y 于是作爲宮室而利。

6/2 爲宮室之法

21/17 Y 然則爲宮室之法將奈何哉。

6/2 曰。高足以辟潤濕。

6/2 邊足以圉風寒。

21/17 Y 子墨子言曰。其旁可以圉風寒。

6/2 上足以待雪霜雨露。

21/17 Y 上可以圉雪霜雨露。

21/18 Y 其中蠲潔。可以祭祀。

6/2 宮牆之高。足以別男女之禮。謹此則止。

21/18 Y 宮牆足以爲男女之別。則止。

6/3 費財勞力不加利者。不爲也。

21/18 Y 諸加費不加民利者。聖王弗爲。

The passage is in bad condition in both versions. I follow Mei's rendering of chapter 21 Y, trying to remain attentive to the most evident breaks.<sup>53</sup>

In ancient times, at the beginning of mankind, when there were as yet no palaces or houses, people lived in caves dug on the sides of hills and mounds. The Sage Kings felt concern, saying that the caves are indeed able to protect from the wind and cold in winter, but that in summer it would be wet below and steaming above, which, it was feared, would hurt the people's health. They thus had palaces and houses built for their (the people's) benefit.

52. The introductory formula is partially parallel to both 11/1 Y and 12/1 H.

53. See Mei, *The Works of Motse*, 122.

Now, the standards set for the building of palaces and houses, what should they be? Master Mozi pronounced: they should be able to protect from both wind and cold on all sides; above, they should be able to protect from snow, frost, rain, and light dew; on the inside, they should be clean so that sacrifices could be performed, and the palace partitions (high) enough to separate men and women. And this should be all. What adds to the expenses, but does not add anything to the people's benefit, the Sage Kings would not have ordered.

The concluding sentence is shared by both chapters 6 and 21 Y; it is, however, not repeated anywhere else in chapter 6, whereas chapter 21 Y carries two other full and one partial instances of it (see 21/4, 9, and 8 respectively). The phrase "*wei gongshi zhi fa*" 爲宮室之法, found at both 6/2 (immediately followed by *yue* 曰) and 21/17 (where it is found instead imbedded within the formula "*ranze* ( . . . ) *jiang naihe zai*" 然則 ( . . . ) 將奈何哉 which Graham saw as being typical of Y), is repeated once as such within chapter 6 (at 6/11) in a somewhat parallel context, but is otherwise clearly part of a fuller formula characteristic of present chapter 21 Y. The full formula is in the form:

古者聖王制爲 X X 之法曰。

The ancient Sage Kings set standards for X X, saying.

It makes its full appearance not less than four times in chapter 21 Y, at 21/3, 4, 8 and 14. (Two broken instances arguably appear at 21/9 and 12 Y).<sup>54</sup>

Chapter 6 has a corresponding formula in the form:

是故聖王作爲 X X

It appears in its nearly full form in the passage from 6/1 given above (without *shi* 是). Chapter 21 Y contains a fragment from it at 21/16, which I have translated to read: "(they) had X X built." A parallel fragment is given back in chapter 6, with *yifu* 衣服 ("clothes") replacing this

54. These two broken instances run simply: *guzhe shengwang wei* ( . . . ) 古者聖王爲, and may at one time have connected with the partial *wei X X zhi fa* (*yue*) 爲 X X 之法 (曰) found at 6/2 and 6/11 in chapter 6. The whole section 21/9–13 Y in which the two instances of *guzhe shengwang wei* appear is itself structured around a recurring pattern in the form *ci X zhi li ye* 此 X 之利也, "this is the benefit of X," which appears five times in this section but nowhere else in the chapter. The section itself has a "digest" air to it. Slightly varying forms of each one of the formulae typical, respectively, of chapter 6 and 21 Y appear in turn in "Digest" chapter 20, at 20/6 and 20/11 respectively.

time *gongshi* as X X. The full chapter 6 formula appears two other times in that chapter, at 6/4 and 6/27 respectively.

The chapter 21 Y formula is used at 21/14 to introduce the standards set by the “Sage Kings” for the proper ways of burial (*jieyang* 節葬 as X X). The whole passage, including the introductory formula, is found repeated in chapter 25 H (“*Jieyang*” *xia*, “Moderation in Funerals”), which treats this matter more specifically. The embedded compound is no longer *jieyang*, however, but the corresponding compound *zangmai* 葬埋, “burials” (see 25/55–56). This passage is partially repeated (without the introductory formula) at 25/62–63, and once again in full form at 25/83–84, but with a twist: the “Sage Kings” of the standard formula are here replaced by “Master” Mozi himself (*ziMozi* 子墨子).

I take this to mean two things. First, and at a simple “technical” level, the shift from the “Sage Kings” to “Master” Mozi might be explained by the presence in a “school” document or “Urtext” (to use Forke’s vocabulary) of a simple *yue* 曰 instead of either one of these two more “elaborated” formulae for quotation. Isolated instances of such *yue* are still to be found distributed throughout the “Essays” introducing authoritative statements of various origins. The Mohists belonging to the “sects” responsible for the transmission of the Y and J series would thus seem to have distinguished themselves in part by their creation of such full quotation formulae they then chose to reuse repeatedly in a standardized fashion. These formulae were devised to fit at least some of the instances of simple *yue* found in the texts.

Second, the repeated appearance in the H “*Jieyang*” chapter 25 of the Y “*Jieyong*” chapter 21’s formula together with its text,<sup>55</sup> could mean that we have in chapter 25 H a form of specialized “elaboration” built out of initial elements first developed in a strictly “*Jieyong*” context. What the H Mohists did not do with chapter 6, in other words, they would seem to have done with what finally became chapter 25 H. The “*Jieyong*” triad in its present form lacks an H chapter (which would have been chapter 22); but then, the present “*Jieyang*” triad correspondingly has as its only member chapter 25 H. Could this perhaps mean that the supposed “*Jieyang*” triad never had any other member?

As already noted, chapter 6 also shows more isolated traces of affinity with passages now found within present chapter 32 (“*Feiyue*” *shang*, “Against Music”), also H, and also listed as the only “surviving” chapter from its triad. It too belongs to some broad “*Jieyong*” problematic, a

55. The text being introduced by the formula itself contains definitive traces consistent with its place in Y chapter 21, such as the use of *zuyi* 足以 instead of *keyi* 可以, as found, for example, in chapter 6. See the note below.



confluence of theme which may be textually secured by comparing the short passages it has in parallel with chapter 6. I find a total of three parallel sets only:

- (1) 6/4 (Sun), 7, 17, 23, 30 必厚作斂於百姓。  
           = 32/8 (2x), 17 H 必厚措斂乎萬民  
           (they must) lay heavy taxes upon the people;
- (2) 6/7, 17 暴奪民衣食之財。  
           = 32/22, 25, 29 H 虧奪民衣食之財。  
           rob the people of their means in terms of food and clothing;
- (3) 6/10 婦人治絲麻 梱布絹。  
           = 32/37, 42 H 婦人治麻絲葛緒網布縵。  
           women produce hemp and silk ( . . . ) and prepare cloth.

Besides the affinities chapter 6 has with chapters 21 Y, especially, and chapter 32 H as well, as we have just seen, the fact is, nevertheless, that it also shares part of its vocabulary and even an occasional parallel with the preceding chapter 5 ("Qihuan" 七患) from within the block of "Epitomes." Chapter 5 is a chapter with which chapter 6 was once said to have run together without any interruption.<sup>56</sup> This would seem to be what had originally authorized Wu Yujiang 吳毓江 to transpose the forty-character long sequence, which in the extant *Daozang* text interrupts a phrase describing what women are expected to do in society (which chapter 6 has in common with the long "school" document quoted under our treatment of *guanfu* above: 6/10 = 32/37, 42 H), from 6/3–4, where Sun Yirang placed it, to 5/23.

The first twenty-five characters of the sequence do seem to fit better in the new context of chapter 5. However, the latter part of the same sequence obviously does not, as it ends with a formula which is repeated three other times in chapter 6 (at 6/7, 17, and 23) but is nowhere to be found in present chapter 5. Wang Huanbiao's reconstruction severs the sequence after the first twenty-five characters. Nevertheless, Wang does not seem to have paid proper attention to the chapter 6 formula at the end of the sequence, as he chooses to keep the last fifteen characters of the sequence within the bounds of chapter 5.

What one may have in chapter 5 is the discarded remnant of a longer chapter or *pian*, the latter part of which might have been at one time

56. See Forke, *Me Ti*, 4–5, referring to Wei Zheng's 魏徵 (A.D. 581–643) *Qunshu zhiyao* 群書治要. The parallel is at 5/19 = 6/8, 14, where chapter 5's *bu keyi* 不可以 is given as *bu zuyi* 不足以. We have seen in the extended quotation above the same type of variation occurring in passages where chapter 21 Y (*keyi*) runs parallel to chapter 6 (once again: *zuyi*).

"reworked" in precisely those terms which we now find to be characteristic of the various "Essay" chapters. Chapter 6 may have occupied the place of the now "missing" chapter 22 in some pre-Han arrangement of the "Jieyong" chapters that would have had present chapter 21 Y somehow already placed before it. But then, it would have been discarded as the various chapters now found in the H series (including chapters 25 H and 32 H) acquired their definitive form. This would in itself count as an argument for the relatively "late" insertion into the texts of the present H chapters of bits and pieces of other "school" documents, whose specific characteristics now serve us to identify the series as a whole.<sup>57</sup>

---

57. The other chapters from the "Epitomes" are more difficult to place in terms of chronology. Their language most often resembles that of chapter 5, for example, or that of the stretches of unpatterned text which are found tucked in between the neatly patterned sentences which characterize the full "Essays" as well as the shorter "digests." As with chapter 4, one does find in chapter 3 ("Suo ran" 所染), for example, scattered instances of parallelisms with the "Essays": 3/10–11 is thus very close textually to 9/58 H ("Shangxian" zhong), with a sentence which is now found in the "Dialogues" at 49/7 ("Luwen") helping us to fill in a break in the parallel. This reminds us that scattered instances of parallelisms with the "Essays" are also present within the "Dialogue" chapters. As their generic title implies, the chapters in this block are predominantly made up of short *ce* recording verbal exchanges between the "Master" Mozi and a number of his disciples or competing intellectuals, as well as a number of other personages including lords of states or principalities, in a manner which is reminiscent of the Confucian Analects or the Mencius. These exchanges are usually very short, only a few ever attaining the length of "Epitome" chapter 7 ("San bian" 三辯), which is ten lines long in the concordanced text and also happens to be set in dialogue form. (Chapter 7 is alone among the "Epitomes" to use the dialogue form, and has indeed often been considered as a stray fragment from the "Dialogues" block). But the "Dialogue" part of the Mozi is not itself wholly made up of dialogues; it also includes a fair number of short *ce* which are expository or argumentative in style and are thus hardly distinguishable from what is now found within the block of "Essays." Close textual parallels with the "Essays" are nonetheless exceptional. Because they share this characteristic with Graham's "Digests," I would tend to treat the "Dialogues" as of later general composition than the "Essays," thereby agreeing with Durrant, albeit on different grounds. (See my treatment of Durrant above. The reference is to Durrant, "An Examination of Textual and Grammatical Problems," 317.) This is said over a possible objection. Among the clear textual parallels between the "Dialogues" and the "Essays," there is indeed one which appears to be in much better condition where it is found in the "Dialogues" than at its place within the block of "Essays." This sentence, which describes the mores of some barbarian population on the fringes of civilization, runs smoothly at 49/27 ("Luwen"), but is more manifestly sundered at 25/78, 75 H ("Jiezang," following the order of the sentence as given at 49/27). It is in my opinion characteristic of the "Essays" to work around what disruptions may have occurred in a way which often looks forced and rather awkward. I take it as a further sign of the probable anteriority of the "Essays" in relation to the "Dialogues."

**The different layers of text within chapters 11 Y, 12 H, and 13 J from the Shangtong" ("Identifying with One's Superior") triad, and their interrelationships**

Chapter 11 Y, which is the shortest chapter in its triad, runs for its full length closely parallel to chapter 12 H, the longest in the triad: this is indeed the second of the two instances Graham noted where "a chapter parallels the whole of another chapter . . . but then continues with entirely new material introduced by a new 'Mo-tzu said.'"<sup>58</sup> Chapter 13 J shares with both of these chapters a number of parallels, but these tend to be scattered, with the notable exception of 13/8–13 J, which closely parallels the beginning of both chapters 11 Y and 12 H.<sup>59</sup>

The internal triad parallels are interrupted at 11/3 Y by a fourteen-character long sequence original to chapter 11 Y within the triad, but which nevertheless has a close parallel in the "Tianzhi" triad at 28/41 J. Chapters 11 Y and 12 H again run parallel right after that sequence for a total of twenty-five characters in Y chapter 11, which again has as its closest parallel a section of chapter 10 J from another triad.<sup>60</sup> When the three "Shangtong" chapters run parallel again after 11/5 Y, this is what we have:

11/5 Y	是故選	天下之賢	可者。
12/6 H	是故選擇	天下賢良聖知辯慧之人。	
13/11 J	是故選擇	賢者。	
11/5 Y	立以爲天子。	天子立。	以其力爲未足。
12/6 H	立以爲天子。		
13/11 J	立	爲天子。	天子以其力爲未足。
12/6 H	使從事乎一同天下之義。		
12/6 H		天子既已立矣。	
12/6 H		以爲唯其耳目之請。	
12/7 H	不能獨一同天下之義。		
13/11 J		獨治天下。	

58. Graham, *Divisions in Early Mohism*, 1. The other instance has already been noted: this is where chapter 37 H from "Feiming" runs parallel to the whole of chapter 36 J for its first twenty-nine lines before running parallel to 32/34–42 H at 37/30–41 H.

59. These are, respectively: 13/8–9 J = 11/1–2 Y = 12/1–2 H; and 13/11–12 J = 11/5–7 Y = 12/6–9 H.

60. The parallel this time is "Shangxian": 11/3–4 Y = 12/3 H = 10/42 J. These are but a few of the many occurrences in the block of "Essays" where the smooth running of the text is more or less abruptly interrupted by a passage which has its equivalent in another chapter, even a chapter from quite another triad.

- 11/6 Y 又選擇天下之  
 12/7 H 是故選擇天下 贊閱  
 13/11 J 是以選擇
- 11/6 Y 賢 可者。置立之以爲三公。  
 12/7 H 賢良聖知辯慧之人。置 以爲三公。  
 13/11 J 其次。 立 爲三公。三公又以  
 其知力爲未足。
- 12/8 H 與從事乎一同天下之義。
- 11/6 Y 天子三公既以立。  
 12/8 H 天子三公既已立矣。
- 11/6 Y 以 天下爲博大。  
 12/8 H 以爲天下 博大。  
 13/11 J 獨 左右天子。
- 11/7 Y 遠國異土之民。是非利害之辯。  
 12/9 H 山林遠 土之民  
 35/7 Y 是非利害之辨。<sup>61</sup>  
 11/7 Y 不可一二而明知。  
 12/9 H 不可得 而 一也。  
 35/7 Y 不可得 而明知也。
- 11/7 Y 故畫分 萬國立諸侯國君。  
 12/9 H 是故靡分天下。設以爲 萬 諸侯國君。  
 13/12 J 是以 分 國建諸侯。 諸侯又以其  
 知力爲未足。
- 12/9 H 使 從事乎 一同天下之義。
- 11/7 Y 諸侯國君既已立。 以其  
 力爲未足。
- 12/9 H 國君既已立矣。  
 12/9 H 又以爲唯其耳目之請。  
 12/10 H 不能 一同其國之義。  
 13/12 J 獨 治其 四境之內也。
- 11/8 Y 又選擇其國之賢可者。  
 12/10 H 是故擇 其國之賢 者。  
 13/12 J 是以選擇其次。
- 11/8 Y 置立之以爲  
 12/10 H 置 以爲左右將軍大夫。  
 13/12 J 立 爲卿之宰。卿之宰又以其知力爲未足。

61. The parallel in chapter 35 Y ("Feiming") cannot escape notice.



moralties on different levels of society, starting at the bottom with that of the village (*li* 里) in chapters 11 Y and 12 H and that of the family or clan (*jia* 家) in chapter 13 J, and so on up through those of the district (*xiang* 鄉) in chapters 11 Y and 12 H only, and of the state (*guo* 國) in all three, to that, finally, of the world (*tianxia* 天下). The present state of the text within all three versions is close to perfect, traces of disruption appearing only at the beginnings and the ends of the three sections considered as wholes. The subject matter is treated within each section in perfectly parallel sentences: these are among the longest highly patterned sections one finds within the block of “Essays.”

Even if they are very close, however, chapters 11 Y and 12 H do use a number of independent phrases or formulae within each of the sub-sections dealing with what should ideally happen at a given level of society. I will first quote the independent phrase which in chapter 12 H serves to introduce the pattern.

12/18,<sup>63</sup> 22, 27 H [里長/鄉長/國君/[?]]治其 [里/鄉/國]。而 [里/鄉/國/[?]]既已治矣。

12/19, 23, 27 H 有率其里/鄉/國/天下之萬民。

12/19, 23, 27 H 曰。凡里/鄉/國/[?] 之萬民。

12/19, 23, 27 H 以尙同乎鄉長/國君/天子/[?]。

12/19, 23, 27 H 皆尙同乎鄉長/國君/天子/[?]。

12/19, 24, 28 H 而不敢下比。

The (village head)/head of district/lord of state/(Son of Heaven) orders his village/district/state/(the world), and having ordered the village/district/state/(the world), he (in turn) leads the people of his village/district/state/(the world) to identify with the head of the district/lord of the state/( . . . ?), saying, “All the people in the village/district/state/( . . . ?) shall identify with the head of the district/lord of the state/( . . . ?) and shall not dare to conspire below.”<sup>64</sup>

I will now revert back to chapter 11 Y, where the pattern is also introduced by a phrase original to it, and then let the parallels appear as they come in the complete rundown of the pattern:

11/13, 16, 19 Y 里長/鄉長/國君者。里/鄉/國之仁人也。里長/鄉長/國君發政里/鄉/國之百姓。

63. The phrase is whole only in the treatments of the district and state levels. Because of manifest disruption, it is almost non-existent in the treatments of the village and world levels at the beginning and end of the section.

64. Compare Mei, *The Works of Motse*, 61–62.

- 11/13, 16, 20 Y 言曰。聞善而不善。必以告其鄉長/國君/天子。
- 11/14, 17, 20 Y 鄉長/國君/天子之所是。必皆是之。
- 12/19, 24, 28 H 鄉長/國君/天子之所是。必亦是之。
- 11/14, 17, 20 Y 鄉長/國君/天子之所非。必皆非之。
- 12/20, 24, 28 H 鄉長/國君/天子之所非。必亦非之。
- 11/14, 18, 21 Y 去若不善言。學鄉長/國君/天子之善言。
- 12/20, 24, 28 H 去而不善言。學鄉長/國君/天子之善言。
- 11/14, 18, 21 Y 去若不善行。學鄉長/國君/天子之善行。
- 12/20, 24, 28 H 去而不善行。學鄉長/國君/天子之善行。
- 12/21, 25, (29) H 鄉長 [etc. . . ] 固鄉 [etc. . . ] 之賢者也。舉鄉 [etc. . . ] 人以法鄉長 [etc. . . ]。
- 11/15, 18, 21 Y 則鄉 [etc. . . ] 何說以 亂哉。察鄉 [etc. . . ] 之所治者。何 也。
- 12/21, 25, 30 H 夫鄉 [etc. . . ] 何說而不治哉。察鄉長 [etc. . . ] 之所以治鄉 [etc. . . ] 者。何故之以也。
- 11/16, 19, 22 Y 鄉長 [etc. . . ] 唯能壹同鄉 [etc. . . ] 之義。是以鄉 [etc. . . ] 治也。
- 12/22, 26, 31 H 曰。 唯以其能一同其鄉 [etc. . . ] 之義。是以鄉 [etc. . . ] 治。

I once more follow Watson's translation with few modifications:

The village head/ head of district/lord of state is the most benevolent man in the village/district/state, and when the village head/ head of district/lord of state takes office, he proclaims to the people in the village/district/state: 'Upon hearing of good or evil, you shall report it to the head of district/lord of state/Son of Heaven.

'What the head of district/lord of state/Son of Heaven approves of all shall approve of; what the head of district/lord of state/Son of Heaven does not approve of none shall approve of. Get rid of evil speech and learn the head of district/ lord of state/Son of Heaven's speech; get rid of evil conduct and learn the head of district/lord of state/Son of Heaven's conduct.'

The head of district/lord of state/( . . . ?) is the most worthy man in the district/state/( . . . ?). If the people in the district/state/(world) take their standards from the head of district/lord of state/Son of Heaven,

then how could there be any disorder in the district/state/world? If we check into the reasons as to why the district/state/world is well ordered, what do we find? It is only because the head of

district/lord of state/Son of Heaven is able to unify the standards of judgment in the district/state/world that the district/state/world is in order.<sup>65</sup>

As I have already noted, the text tends to become blurred in all three versions just at the point where this “Shangtong” (“Identifying with One’s Superior”) problematique reaches the highest level in the hierarchy, the level of Heaven.

I shall not quote extensively from the chapter 13 J version. What parallels there are within this section with anything found in either chapter 11 Y or 12 H do not refer directly to passages within either one of the two corresponding sections in the other chapters, but rather to passages which are found, in those chapters, in a block which is inserted between the common passage considered above (11/5–8 Y = 12/6–11 H = 13/11–13 J) and the sections just treated (11/13–22 Y = 12/20–31 H). The more obvious parallels are: 13/38 J = 12/14 H = 11/10 Y; 13/38 J (with a perfectly exact parallel in 28/56 J) = 12/16 H = 11/12 Y; and 13/39 J = 12/17 H. These parallels are all confined in chapter 13 J to the last subsection, dealing with the Son of Heaven and the world.

This last subsection in chapter 13 J opens with a patterned phrase, reading:

13/37 J 天子亦爲發憲布令於天下之衆曰。

The Son of Heaven also issues regulations and proclaims to the multitudes of the world, saying ( . . . )<sup>66</sup>

Now this phrase may have a parallel in chapter 11 Y at 11/8 in the form:

11/8 Y 天子發政於天下之百姓。言曰，

which Watson translates:

the Son of Heaven proclaimed the principle of his rule to the people of the world, saying ( . . . ).<sup>67</sup>

The pattern is clearly the one we had above in our quotations from chapter 11 Y’s “independent” phrases 11/13, 16, and 19, with the simple adjunction of the particle *yu* 於 after *fazheng* 發政. That these phrases are parallel is confirmed by what follows directly at 11/9 Y:

聞善而不善  
upon hearing of good or evil,

which is exactly what one had at 11/13, 16, and 20 Y.

65. See Watson, *Mo Tzu*, 36–37.

66. See Mei, *The Works of Motse*, 74.

67. See Watson, *Mo Tzu*, 35.



What directly follows at 11/9 Y uses a different pattern, which is itself repeated in the negative mode just below at 11/10 Y, where it is preceded by the phrase:

11/10 Y 意若聞見善而不善

if, upon hearing *and seeing* good and evil ( . . . ),<sup>68</sup>

a phrase which itself has a good two-part parallel in chapter 12 H at 12/14, that is, right after the isolated parallel I noted above between 13/38 J and 12/14 H. The block in which it appears also begins with a phrase involving the Son of Heaven:

12/12 H 天子爲發政施教。曰。凡聞見善者。

the Son of Heaven, proclaiming the principle of his rule, instructs (the people) saying: “Those who hear *and see* good . . . ,”

which locks on to the text that begins the parallel block in chapter 11 Y at 11/9.

It would seem then that one had at 11/8–9 Y a displaced fragment of what is expected to have followed on line 11/22 Y at the point where the patterned sets now stop. Let us play with the notion for a while: if this is indeed the case, is there any place anywhere where one finds what would then be expected to be missing in between, namely, in parallel with 11/13, 16, and 19 Y, the phrase:

天子者。天下之仁人也。

the Son of Heaven is the most benevolent man in the world?

The answer is: yes; but it is not found within present chapter 11 Y at all, but instead in chapter 12 H, right at the point where the “independent” chapter 12 H phrase on the pattern of 12/21 and 25 would be expected. The pattern would have given:

天子固天下之賢者也。舉天下人以法天子。

the Son of Heaven is the most worthy man in the world. If the people in the world take their standards from the Son of Heaven. . . .

What is found instead is:

12/29 H 天子者。固天下之仁人也。舉天下之萬民以法天子。

the Son of Heaven is the most benevolent man in the world. If the people in the world take their standards from the Son of Heaven. . . .

68. See Watson, *Mo Tzu*, 36.

A disruption is manifest here. 12/30–31 H follows on correctly after *yi fa tianzi* 以法天子, once more parallel to 11/21–22 Y. The text then shifts emphasis, with the key passage 12/31 H = 11/22–23 Y where it is said that, “although (all) may identify themselves with the Son of Heaven, if (he?) does not identify (himself) with Heaven, then (Heaven’s) calamities will never cease.” The text becomes even more badly corrupted at this point, with chapter 11 Y still running roughly in parallel to chapter 12 H (11/23–24 Y = 12/32–33 H), but with passages in common with chapter 27 H from the “Tianzhi” triad interrupting the parallel at different points in chapter 12 H.

What follows in chapter 12 H (12/35–41) has a number of parallels with chapter 9 H, but absolutely none with chapter 11 Y. The “new ‘Mo-tzu said’” mentioned by Graham does not appear before the end of this passage. One actually has to wait for line 12/48 H to connect on to what appears in chapter 11 Y as its conclusion (12/49 H = 11/24–25 Y). In what follows, chapter 12 H is once again on its own, with close parallelisms in common with chapter 13 J.<sup>69</sup>

Together with the three chapters from the “Feiming” triad, as Graham noted, the three chapters we have just considered are undoubtedly the ones which have the most parallels in common within a single triad. The different ways in which the parallels themselves are arranged within a chapter tells us that the history of a possible “Urtext” for these chapters is much more complicated than Forke had fathomed. Instead of a single “Urtext” for a triad, we have to consider several. And as the texts or “internal” documents the different chapters draw upon are varied and of altogether different dates, what is to be retained of Forke’s notion is simply the fact that the ancient Mohists did indeed draw on “written” materials and probably never ceased, in turn, to record in writing the arguments they developed from them.

In the spaces where the texts do not connect, one may appeal, as Graham did explicitly, to “oral transmission.” But then, as I already noted at the beginning of this paper, what might be called “oral” merely reveals a relative lack of textual unity: the word must not be taken too literally. What strikes me is rather the lengths to which the early Mohists went in “recuperating” whatever written material they had, even when it was in an already badly fragmented state, for reuse in new contexts.

---

69. These are found at 12/49 H = 13/16 J; 12/54–55, 59 H = 13/21 J; 12/63–64 H = 13/51–53 J; and 12/66–68 H = 13/48–49 J. There are two other traces in this part of a possible interaction with chapter 9 H.

**Some internal relationships between “Tianzhi” (“The Will of Heaven”) chapter 28 J and the “Feigong” (“Against Offensive Warfare”) problematique of chapters 17, 18 Y, and 19 H**

Alfred Forke, when considering what to include and what to exclude as part of a postulated “Urtext” for the “Essay” chapters, noted that present chapter 17 (“Feigong” *shang*) seemed to be very different from either one of the two other chapters in the triad, but had instead close affinities with the end of present chapter 28 J in the “Tianzhi” triad (“Tianzhi” *xia*).<sup>70</sup> He nonetheless chose to retain chapter 17 as constitutive of his “Urtext” for “Feigong,” citing the end of chapter 28 J as a parallel.<sup>71</sup> Graham, as we have seen, took quite another tack on this: noting that chapter 28 J runs parallel to the same triad’s chapter 26 Y for most of its length, down to the passage where the parallel with chapter 17 is found, he ended up treating chapter 17 as a mere misplaced fragment from the end of present chapter 26 Y; i. e., rightfully belonging to “Tianzhi.”<sup>72</sup>

As Graham noted, chapter 17 lacks any instance of any of the criteria which serve to identify membership in one of his three “series.” What he did not note, however, is that the much longer passage at the end of chapter 28 J where the parallels with chapter 17 are found also lacks any such criteria. Closer scrutiny shows this passage to have a number of parallels with yet another chapter from the “Feigong” triad, that is, chapter 19 H (“Feigong” *xia*).

The longest of these close parallels is at 28/47–48 J = 19/11–12 H, while another is found at 28/62 J = 19/4 H. The longest parallel chapter 28 J has with chapter 17 comes sometime after that, at 28/65–66 J = 17/11–12:

17/11	今有人於此。少見黑曰黑。多見黑曰白。	
28/65 J	今有人於此。少而示之黑謂之黑。多示之黑謂白。	
17/11		則以此人不知白黑之辯矣。
28/65 J	必曰吾目亂。	不知黑白之別。
17/12		少嘗苦曰苦。多嘗苦曰甘。
28/66 J	今有人於此。能少嘗之甘謂甘。多嘗謂苦。	
17/12	則必	以此人爲不知甘苦之辯矣。
28/66 J	必曰吾口亂。	不知其甘苦之味。

This is Watson’s translation of the passage in present chapter 17:

70. Forke, *Me Ti*, 24.

71. Forke, *Me Ti*, 133–136.

72. Graham, *Divisions in Early Mohism*, 3–4.

Now if there were a man who, on seeing a little bit of black, called it black but, on seeing a lot of black, called it white, we would conclude that he could not tell the difference between black and white.

Or if there were a man who, on tasting a little bit of bitterness, called it bitter but, on tasting a lot, called it sweet, we would conclude that he could not distinguish between bitter and sweet.<sup>73</sup>

This passage is introduced in chapter 28 J (at 28/64) by a sentence asking “how is it at all different from confusing the distinctions between black and white, and sweet and bitter?”<sup>74</sup>

28/64 J 豈有以異是黃黑白甘苦之辯者哉。

This sentence is repeated two lines down from the end of this passage (at 28/68 J, but with *bie* 別 “distinctions” in lieu of *bian* 辯). The repeated sentence is in turn immediately followed by a pattern formula:

28/69 J 故子墨子置天之以爲儀法。

Thus Master Mozi established the (Will) of Heaven as his standard,<sup>75</sup>

two previous instances of which were given in chapter 28 J at 28/44 and 45 around a passage dealing with wheelwright compasses and carpenter squares that has close parallels in chapter 26 Y as well as in chapter 27 H (28/44 J = 26/41 Y = 27/63–67 H). The instances of the pattern formula at 28/45 J and 28/69 J may actually serve to signal the outer boundaries of the extended unmarked passage in which all the instances of parallels with both chapter 17 and 19 H from “Feigong” are to be found.

This passage, which should run, by my count, from 28/45 or 47 to 28/68, has a single other instance of a parallel with another chapter from the block of “Essays” (28/56 J = 13/31 also J). This short parallel with chapter 13 J is itself part of the somewhat longer parallel 28/56 J has with 17/1.<sup>76</sup>

It would be possible, in other words, to treat the whole “Tianzhi” passage as Graham treated chapter 17, but in reverse, and consider it as a fragment from the “Feigong” triad, which in its present state actually

73. See Watson, *Mo Tzu*, 51.

74. See Mei, *The Works of Motse*, 158.

75. See Mei, *The Works of Motse*, 159.

76. The shorter instances of parallelism with both chapters 17 and 19 H from “Feigong” are at 28/58 J = 17/3 and 5; and at 28/50, 51, 54 J = 19/30, 48, and 50 H, where the phrase is a formula repeated verbatim in both chapters. A clear connection with a member of its own triad appears at 28/69–70 J with a quote from a “Book of the Former Kings” (*xianwang zhi shu* 先王之書), which is also given at 27/52 H.

lacks, as we have seen, its corresponding J member. Just as Graham identified an H passage in the middle of chapter 35 Y of “Feiming” and proposed shifting it to some undeterminable place in 37 H, we might detach 28/45–68 from chapter 28 J, but without knowing exactly where to place it in the present text of the “Feigong” triad.<sup>77</sup> This would eliminate one of the difficulties Graham already had with chapter 28’s membership in the J series: in its present state, chapter 28 J stands out as the one J chapter with a length uncharacteristically comparable to that

---

77. See Graham, *Divisions in Early Mohism*, 14–15. That this passage, 28/45 or 47 to 68, is somewhat heterogeneous within chapter 28 J may be confirmed on yet another count. Graham addressed the interesting issue of the assumed “Audiences of the Three Series.” Noting that “the difference in audience shows up most clearly in the concluding formulae,” he remarked that “in H the appeals are to ‘kings, dukes, great men and officer gentlemen’ (*wang gong daren shi junzi* 王公大人士君子), or, in the case of the more private issues, mourning, music, fatalism, simply to the ‘officer gentlemen.’ The officer gentlemen are described in ch. 32/34–40 H as those who hold offices and collect taxes, in contrast with the kings, dukes, and great men who attend court.” Graham also noted that “in Y on the other hand the concluding appeals are solely to the officer gentlemen, and these are identified, not as holders of office, but as . . . rival thinkers. . . .” As for J, it “addresses both audiences. The concluding formulae of his ‘T’ien chih’ and ‘Fei ming’ chapters appeal only to the officer gentlemen, whom like Y he identifies with his opponents on the issues of the will of Heaven and fatalism. . . . In the two political chapters on the other hand the appeal is to ‘kings, dukes and great men,’ whom like H he repeatedly specifies as the ‘kings, dukes and great men of today’”; Graham, *Divisions*, 18–20. If one considers all instances of both *wang gong daren* and *shi junzi*, one notes that, whereas H is indeed mostly characterized by its repeated appeals to the “kings, dukes and great men of today,” the matter is less clear with regard to the other series. The most numerous instances of the *wang gong daren* formula are to be found for both H and J in the “more political” “Shangxian” triad: chapter 9 H has a total of 13 instances of the formula, but chapter 10 J has even more instances of it: 19 instances in all, if we include the “concluding formula” which conflates *wang gong daren* and *shi junzi*. With only two exceptions, the *shi junzi* formula is regularly part of a longer formula which reads: *jin tianxia zhi shi junzi* 今天下之士君子. There are six instances of it in chapter 10 J (including the “concluding formula”), and just as many in chapter 28 J. This is the highest number one gets of instances of the *shi junzi* formula within a single chapter. The next highest number is in chapter 26 Y, also from the “Tianzhi” triad: the total there is five instances. (Chapter 15 Y has three). Now, chapter 27 H from “Tianzhi” has no instance of the *shi junzi* formula, but two of the rival *wang gong daren* formula. Chapter 28 J also happens to have three instances of the *wang gong daren* formula, and these are all to be found concentrated in the section I have just discussed, at 28/59, 61, and 67. By contrast, the six instances of *shi junzi* are in the sections of chapter 28 J which run parallel to either chapter 26 Y or 27 H from the same triad: see 28/1, 18, 34, 45, and 46 (which would indicate that one should actually see the heterogeneous section starting at 28/47 instead of 28/45), as well as 28/71. Chapter 26 Y has no instance of the *wang gong daren* formula; chapter 19 H has three, including the “concluding formula” in which it is conflated with the single instance of *shi junzi*. Chapter 18 Y has two, but no instance of *shi junzi*.

of the same triad's H chapter, H being otherwise invariably the longest chapter in a triad. (Chapter 27 H is 73 lines long, and the length of chapter 28 J is presently 72 lines). The removal of 28/45–68 would shorten chapter 28 J to approximately 49 lines, a length that is comparable to that of the J chapter in the "Shangxian" triad, for example.

But this appears to me to be only part of the correct answer. We should by now be familiar with the problem: 28/45–68 has no series markings, and this reminds us of what was said above regarding the probable history of texts such as present chapters 5, 6, 21 Y and 25 H.

The passage in question from chapter 28 J might simply be the remnants of an older document, of which present chapter 17 is the closest extant variant. This document was shared by members of different "schools" of Mohism, whose written productions were later condensed into the three different compendia we have from the hands of Graham's three "sects." But it had probably had time meanwhile to serve as a basis for further "elaboration," inspiring developments which might have first found room within a broadly conceived "Feigong" ("Against Offensive Warfare") problematique, on the one hand, and within a "Tianzhi" ("The Will of Heaven") problematique, on the other.

In the middle of the passage, just before the first parallel with chapter 17, there is a short passage quoting Mozi referring in the first person to a prior saying of his, according to which "matters are understood if on a small scale", but "are not if on a large scale." (See 28/55 J: "( . . . ) *dawu ze bu zhi ye*, ( . . . ) *xiaowu ze zhi zhi* ( . . . )" ( . . . ) 大物則不知也, ( . . . ) 小物則知之 ( . . . ).<sup>78</sup> The parallel reference in the chapter (although broken to read only the first part of it) is at 28/7 J. This is well within the part chapter 28 J has in parallel with chapter 26 Y of the same triad. Another version of the same saying of Mozi's (but without the *wu* 物 for "matters") is quoted and worked on at the very beginning of the chapter (28/1–2 J, with a good parallel in 10/11 J), which is once more within the part chapter 28 J has in common with chapter 26 Y (28/1 J = 26/1 Y). It is this time explicitly said in chapter 28 J that what is "not understood" is "Heaven's intention" (*tian zhi yi* 天之意). But this is clearly "elaboration": the proper context for what appears here as a formula is that of the passage at 28/55 J. I quote what follows from Watson's translation of the corresponding text in "Feigong" chapter 17:

If a man enters an orchard and steals the peaches and plums, every one who hears about it will condemn him, and if those who administer the government catch him they will punish him. Why? Because he injures others to benefit himself.

78. See Mei, *The Works of Motse*, 157.

When it comes to carrying off dogs, swine, chickens, and pig-lings, the deed is even more unrighteous than entering an orchard to steal peaches and plums. Why? Because the loss to others is greater. It shows a greater lack of benevolence and is a more serious crime.

And when it comes to murdering an innocent man, stripping him of his clothing, and appropriating his spear and sword, the deed is even more unrighteous. . . . Why? Because the injury to others is even greater, and if the injury is greater, it shows a greater lack of benevolence and is a more serious crime.

Now all the gentlemen in the world know enough to condemn such acts and brand them as unrighteous. And yet when it comes to the even greater unrighteousness of offensive warfare against other states, they do not know enough to condemn it. On the contrary, they praise it and call it righteous. Is this what it means to know the difference between righteousness and unrighteousness?<sup>79</sup>

The proper context for both the saying and the pattern formula is clearly that of the “Feigong” (“Against Offensive Warfare”) problematique; and yet, neither the saying nor the formula appears in any of the present “Feigong” chapters.

The “black” and “white” example common to both chapters 17 and 28 J, which I quoted above, also responds to the same “large” and “small” question, although set in terms of “little” and “much.” Chapter 27 H does not have the “large” and “small” formula, but has instead a short reference towards its end (27/71 H) to “black” and “white” that actually serves to complicate the matter somewhat. The best parallel in this case is with the brief mention of the two colors in chapter 19 H at 19/5, that is, right after a passage chapter 19 H has in common with chapter 28 J and which may be translated (19/4 H = 28/62 J):

In today’s world, the feudal lords all continue to attack and assault each other.

What follows may be rendered thus:

This then comes down to praising righteousness in words (*ming* 名), but without checking on its reality (*shi* 實). This is like blind men, who talk about black and white in the same way as ordinary men, but in practice cannot distinguish between (black and white) things (*wu* 物). How can this be called discrimination (*bie* 別)?<sup>80</sup>

79. See Watson, *Mo Tzu*, 50–51.

80. Compare Watson, *Mo Tzu*, 52, and Mei, *The Works of Motse*, 107.

The “black” and “white” context in chapter 19 H, then, is slightly more sophisticated than that of either chapter 17 or chapter 28 J. Where the two colors reappear at the end of present “Tianzhi” chapter 27 H, we seem to have gone even a step further: were one to “measure the benevolence and lack of benevolence of the rulers and ministers of the world” by taking “Heaven’s intention” (*tian zhi yi* 天之意) as a “standard” (*fa* 法/ *yi* 儀), it would be “as easy,” translates Watson, “as telling black from white.”<sup>81</sup> This can give us a partial clue as to the possible steps in an evolution of the “Tianzhi” argument out of a prior “Feigong” context.

“Tianzhi”’s relative “lateness” as a subject might be partially decided on a number of other counts, two of which point to a contrast with chapter 31 H (“Minggui” *xia* 明鬼下) as essentially composed of relatively “early” material.

Chapter 26 Y contains towards its beginning a sentence having to do with Heaven’s ability to “clearly discern be it in the woods, valleys, or solitary caves where there is no man.” This has two parallels in chapter 31 H where the “demons and spirits” (*guishen* 鬼神) occupy the place given over to “Heaven” in the “Tianzhi” chapter.

26/7 Y 夫 天 可爲 林 谷  
 31/81 H 故鬼神之明。不可爲幽閒廣澤。山林梁谷。  
 31/42 H 雖有 梁谿 博林  
 26/7 Y 幽門無人。 明必見之。  
 31/81 H 鬼神之明必知之。  
 31/42 H 幽澗毋人之所 … 視之

All three “Tianzhi” chapters also happen to have an unusual development about being “killed although innocent” (*sha buguzhe* 殺不辜者), which, as with the “small/great” formula mentioned above, would seem to find part of its context in one of the passages from chapter 17 already quoted. I would nevertheless look for its best context in the extensive illustrations drawn from popular “stories” which are found within chapter 31 H: these stories deal with loyal ministers being “killed though innocent” by their lords, with the ghosts of the ministers making predicted apparitions a couple of years later in order to avenge their deaths. They all concentrate in an extensive and relatively well structured passage (31/15–41 H) which ends immediately before the first of the parallels I noted with chapter 26 Y. (31/41 H = 26/7 H). (Chapter 28 J also has a good parallel with 31/19 H repeated three times at 28/3, 4, and 7 J, in the part where it runs parallel to chapter 26 Y).

If “Tianzhi” as a full triad can thus be shown to feed selectively on

81. See Watson, *Mo Tzu*, 92.



parts of other texts, one should nevertheless be more generally aware that judgments of anteriority and posteriority do not necessarily apply consistently to whole chapters, to say nothing of whole triads: different degrees of seniority are generally discernable within a single chapter. I would take chapters 19 H and 31 H as on the whole “earlier” than any of the three “Tianzhi” chapters, though there are traces in both chapters of a succession of “later” interventions.

Once the “Ten Theses” are seen as having possibly grown out of each other, the three “schools” or “sects,” whose practical existence prior to Han Graham so convincingly proved, can only appear as a relatively late occurrence in the history of Mohism. It is even possible that some of the chapters now designated as “missing” in the table of contents actually never saw the light of day. As for chapters that are linguistically unmarked, or unmarked passages occurring within clearly identifiable series chapters, they may have originated in times when the three “sects” had not yet developed.

### The “Feiming” (“Against Destiny”) chapters

Graham was forced to burrow below the level of the *pian* in the case of the three “Feiming” chapters. All three chapters are now extant, but the H chapter in this triad is chapter 37 (“Feiming” *xia*), and not, as one would have expected, chapter 36 (“Feiming” *zhong*). Instead, chapter 36 satisfies J criteria.

The problems, as we have already seen, begin with the presence in chapter 35 Y of an extended passage full of H criteria (35/18–33 or 35). It is nevertheless difficult to find a place for it in chapter 37 H.<sup>82</sup> As was the case of the three chapters from the “Shangtong” triad, the three chapters from “Feiming” also run fairly parallel to each other for long stretches. This is the case in particular of the long introduction in which three “tests” for argument (*biao* 表 in chapter 35 Y and *fa* 法 in the other two) are set out. But, whereas chapters 36 J and 37 H begin with the enunciation of the three tests, the parallel does not occur in chapter 35 Y until line 35/6 (35/6–9 Y = 36/1–4 J = 37/1–4 H).

There is, as Graham noted, “a striking difference between the three versions: the second test in chapter 35 and 37 is the evidence of the people’s ears and eyes (*baixing er mu zhi shi* 百姓耳目之實 and *zhongzhi er mu zhi qing* 衆之耳目之請 respectively), in chapter 36 it is the books of

82. This passage has a number of parallels in common with chapter 9 H from the “Shangxian” triad (35/22, 25–26 = 9/12–13 H; 35/31–32 = 9/28–29 H), and two with chapter 11 Y from the “Shangtong” triad (35/30 = 11/10 Y; 35/32 = 11/12 Y).

the former kings (*xianwang zhi shu* 先王之書). Both chapters 35 and 37 proceed to apply the first two tests to the existence of destiny, but . . . chapter 35/10–18 applies the tests of chapter 36, chapter 36/5–13 of chapter 35.<sup>83</sup> Graham thus proposed a reconstruction of both chapters 35 Y and 36 J, in which 35/10–18 (in his more “simple solution”<sup>84</sup>) was transposed to chapter 36 J and shown to fit in the space left blank by the removal of 36/5–13, and with 36/5–13 being transposed to chapter 35 Y and shown in turn to fit in the space left blank by the removal of 35/10–18. The fit depends on the occurrence of the *jin tianxia zhi shi junzi* 今天下之士君子 (“the officer gentlemen of today”) formula in both chapters 35 Y (at 35/10 and 12) and 36 J (at 36/5 only).<sup>85</sup>

Graham took the presence of the grammatical compound *weiwu* (here written 雖毋) at 35/17 as indicative that the passage could not belong to Y: *weiwu* occurs regularly in both H and J, but the only other place where it occurs in Y is in “Shangxian” chapter 8 Y at 8/3, 4, which is right at the beginning of a passage Graham took to be transposed from H because of the threefold occurrence of the particle *hu* at 8/7.<sup>86</sup> This is actually the only strictly linguistic criterion Graham had available to justify his transpositions.

I hope this example demonstrates how my own approach, though deeply influenced by Graham’s, nevertheless leads in directions which are importantly different from his. Graham was so concentrated on the task of proving the existence of the three “sects” of Mohism on the eve of Han that, as he said at the end of his study, he deliberately chose to ignore “all questions of dating.”<sup>87</sup> But questions of relative chronology have been primordial in my own attempt to make more sense of the text as it is.

What I immediately see in the presence of the compound *weiwu* at 35/17 is its proximity to the beginning of the passage (35/18–33 or 35), which Graham chose, on strictly linguistic rather than merely thematic grounds, to attribute to H. Could the sentence with *weiwu* a mere one line above this passage actually be part of it? I think it could. We have just seen that *weiwu* occurs in H as well as in J. But could the whole passage which speaks specifically of the “Books of the Former Kings” at

83. Graham, *Divisions in Early Mohism*, 12–13.

84. Graham, *Divisions in Early Mohism*, 13–14.

85. The difference between Graham’s “simple” and more “complicated” solutions comes down to whether one chooses to leave “the sections on the sages’ practice” (test number one, *shengwang zhi shi* 聖王之事, chapters 35/10–12, 36/9–13) “in the same chapters as before.” See Graham, *Divisions in Early Mohism*, 14.

86. Graham, *Divisions in Early Mohism*, 13 and 6.

87. Graham, *Divisions in Early Mohism*, 28.

35/12–18, and which, on the face of it, served to justify the chapter 35 Y half of the mutual transposition with chapter 36 J, somehow originate in H as well? There are no firm textual criteria in this passage, but there is an interesting parallel with a passage which is now found only in chapter 37 H (35/14, 15, 16 = 37/26–27 H):

35/14, 15, 16:	[先不之憲/刑/誓亦嘗有]	曰。	禍不可請。
35/14, 15, 16:			禍不可諱。
35/14, 15, 16:			敬
37/26 H:	[在彼殷王。謂人有命。]	謂	敬不可行。
35/14, 15, 16:			無益。
37/26 H:		謂	祭無益。
35/14, 15, 16:			暴無傷[者乎。]
37/27 H:		謂	暴無傷。

The passage is repeated three times in chapter 35 within a patterned three-part structure, where it is introduced each time by the formula: “Among the ‘statutes’ (*xian* 憲) / ‘codes of punishment’ (*xing* 刑) / ‘declarations’ (*shi* 誓) of the Former Kings, were there any that said: . . . ?” The passage is rendered thus by Watson:<sup>88</sup>

Good fortune cannot be sought for and bad fortune cannot be avoided.  
Being reverent will not help your chance and doing evil will not harm them.

In order to remain mindful of the parallel, I translate the passage as found in chapter 37 H as follows:

(The King of Yin) said: Being reverent cannot be practiced.  
He said: Sacrifices will not help your chances.  
He said: Doing evil will not harm them.<sup>89</sup>

The passage seems in chapter 37 H to be part of an actual quotation from one of the “Books of the Former Kings.” It comes towards the end of a whole section which is itself entirely devoted to quotations from such books, and has a number of close parallels with comparable passages in both of the two other “Feiming” chapters.<sup>90</sup> The passage is also immediately followed in 37 H by a parallel with chapter 32 H (37/25 H = 32/45 H), which is itself part of a quotation from the “Books of the

88. See Watson, *Mo tzu*, 119.

89. Compare Mei, *The Works of Motse*, 197.

90. The close parallels are: 37/21 H = 36/23–24 J; 37/23–24 H = 36/24–25 J = 35/39 Y; 37/25 H = 36/25 J = 35/40 Y; and 37/28 H = 36/27 J = 35/42 Y.

Former Kings.” The text is manifestly in bad condition at this point: this is the part in chapter 37 H where the general parallelism with chapter 36 J comes to an end and 37 H “continues with (the) entirely new material” we found to be parallel to chapter 32/34–38 H.<sup>91</sup>

Even if it is a badly disrupted passage, the best originating context for the “development” of 35/12–18 in chapter 35 Y seems to be provided by 37 H. This still does not exclude, of course, a possible affiliation of the passage with chapter 36 J, as suggested by Graham, sometime during the relatively late stages in the history of that chapter. My point is, however, that whether we ultimately decide to attribute the passage to J or not, enough traces are left in the present text of chapter 35 Y to indicate that the history of the passage is longer and more complex, and that it is from a reasoned reconstruction of its history that we may one day be able to tell how it ended up at its present place within chapter 35 Y.

The whole introduction to chapter 36 J, where the “Books of the Former Kings” are cited, somewhat awkwardly, as one of the three tests for argument, itself has a number of manifest traces of disruption. Test number one, for example, mentions, besides the “practice of the Sage Kings” (*shengwang zhi shi* 聖王之事, which is a test common to all three “Feiming” chapters), the “Will of Heaven and the spirits” (*tiangui zhi zhi* 天鬼之志), and this is, of course, one of the two instances in J of the compound *tiangui* which we have seen to be otherwise characteristic of H.<sup>92</sup> If doubt can be thrown on the integrity of this introduction, it cannot but affect our decision about where to place the passage in 35 Y that Graham chose to attribute to J. Likewise, it cannot but affect our evaluation of J’s alleged “conservatism.” A “conservative” late J re-arranger may indeed have chosen to rework the elements of text that were transmitted to him along lines which suited his temper. But does this mean that the active J “sect” developed along “conservative” lines?<sup>93</sup>

---

91. A close parallel with a sentence in a chapter from quite another triad is also found at this point, always a sure sign of disruption: 37/29 H = 27/67–68 H.

92. See 36/3 J. The awkwardness of test number two in chapter 36 J comes from the fact that test one, the “practice of the Sage Kings,” would seem to call by itself for some sort of consultation of the “Books of the Former Kings.” As we have seen, the “Books” are in fact abundantly referred to in both J and H, as well as in Y as far as the “Feiming” triad is concerned; see 35/39–42 Y. The presentation of the first two tests is announced by the formula: *yu qi ben/yuan zhi ye* 於其本/原之也, and test number two is presented thus: *zheng yi xianwang zhi shu* 徵以先王之書. This is one of only two occurrences of *zheng* in the whole Mozi corpus. The announcement of the third test, which follows immediately, is out of pattern: *yong zhi naihe* 用之奈何, instead of the expected *yu qi yong zhi ye*.

93. Another textual basis for judging J’s relative “conservatism” is chapter 13 J’s mention of the “family” or clan (*jia* 家), in the patterned sets original to it at 13/22–29,

The case for the inclusion of 36/5–13 in Y (according to Graham's more "simple solution") is, on the other hand, somewhat stronger than it seems. It is not without some problems of its own, which once more have to do with the closeness of part of this passage with a parallel passage in one of the H chapters. But the case does not depend entirely upon the adequacy of the "ears and eyes" theme in chapter 35 Y, or upon the quality of the fit at 35/10. Lines 36/9–13 constitute an illustration of the first test (the "Sage Kings' practice"); I will discount it here. (This is the chapter 36 section Graham would leave "in the same chapter as before" in his more "complicated solution").<sup>94</sup> Within the section dealing specifically with the "ears and eyes of the people" (test number two in the introduction to both Y and H), lines 36/8–9 are a simple repeat of lines 36/6–7. What I propose to concentrate on, then, are lines 36/5–7: these have a close parallel in chapter 31 H at 31/10–12. But when we look more closely at the passage in chapter 31 H, we find that it is preceded there by a short introduction which has its best parallel in chapter 35 Y, right above the long section outlining the three tests. As I have already noted, this comes relatively late in chapter 35 Y (31/8–10 H = 35/5–6 Y). I quote the whole passage below.

31/8 H 故當 鬼神之有無之別。以爲將不可以明察此者也。  
 35/5 Y 故當執有命者之言。 不可不明辯。  
 31/9 H 既以鬼神 有無之別。以爲 不可不 察已。  
 31/9 H 然則 吾 爲 明察此。  
 35/6 Y 然則 明辯此。

instead of the village (*li* 里) which is mentioned in parallel in both Y and H (11/13 Y and 12/18 H); see Graham, *Divisions in Early Mohism*, 23. The text is intact here, and the elements of proof consequently more firm. Another difference with both Y and H in the "Shangtong" triad is that J seems to have, within those same patterned passages, the "lords" (*jun* 君) of family, state, and empire call upon their subjects to conform, not to the power above them as is clearly stated in Y and H, but to themselves. (See Graham, *Divisions*, 23). But the matter is already less coherent than it seems at first sight: the lords of family, state, and empire are also told within the same sets to "organize the purposes of their family / state / empire and identify them with those of the state / emperor / and Heaven" (13/29, 36, 42 J). And when much of the same matter is brought up again in the context of the "Tianzhi" ("Will of Heaven") triad, the passage in chapter 28 J which says that "the gentlemen of the world all understand that the emperor sets the standard for the world but do not understand that Heaven sets the standard for the emperor" (*jin tianxia zhi shi junzi jie ming yu tianzi zhi zheng tianxia ye, er bu ming yu tian [zhi] zheng [tianzi] ye* 今天下之士君子皆明於天子之正天下也。而不明於天[之]正[天子]也。), the wording of the passage looks suspiciously close to that of a comparable passage found at the end of "Shangtong" chapter 11 Y. (See 28/13 J = 11/22 Y. The the *Daozang* text lacks both *zhi* and *tianzi*, but this does not seem to affect the integrity of the passage in any important way).

94. See Graham, *Divisions in Early Mohism*, 14.

- 31/10 H 其說 將奈何而可。子墨子 曰。  
 35/6 Y 之說 將奈何哉。 子墨子言曰。[...]
- 31/10 H 是與天下之 所以察知 有與無之道者。  
 36/5 J 我所以 知命之有與亡 者。
- 31/10 H 必以衆之耳目之實 知有與亡爲儀者也。  
 36/5 J 以衆之耳目之情 知有與亡。
- 31/11 H 請或聞之 見之。則必以爲 [之有。  
 36/6 J 有聞之。有見之。 謂 之有。
- 31/11 H 莫 聞 莫 見。則必以爲之] 無。  
 36/6 J 莫之聞。莫之見。 謂之 亡。
- 31/11 H 若是何 不 嘗入一鄉一里而問之。  
 36/6 J 然胡 [不] 嘗 考之百姓之情。
- 31/11 H 自古以及今。生民以來者。  
 36/6 J 自古以及今。生民以來者。
- 31/12 H 亦有嘗見鬼神之物。  
 36/6 J 亦 嘗見 命之物。
- 31/12 H 聞鬼神之聲。  
 36/7 J 聞 命之聲者乎。
- 31/12 H 則 [...]  
 36/7 J 則未嘗有也。

I simply follow Watson's translation of the chapter 31 H version:

(... One) must face this question of whether ghosts and spirits exist or not and examine it. It is clear that one must examine this question of whether ghosts and spirits exist or not. Well then, if the examination is to be sound, what method (*shuo* 說) should we use?

Master Mozi said: The way to determine whether something exists or not is to find out whether people actually know from the evidence of their own ears and eyes whether it exists, and use it as a standard. If someone has actually heard it and seen it, then we must assume that it exists. But if no one has heard or seen it, then we must assume that it does not exist. If this is to be our method, then why don't we try going to some village or community and asking?

If from antiquity to today, from the beginning of mankind to the present, there have been people who have seen ghostlike and spirit-like creatures and heard their voices, then ...<sup>95</sup>

95. The parallel stops at this point.

If the whole passage together with its introduction can be counted as a good parallel, it nonetheless speaks in chapter 31 H of the existence or nonexistence of “ghosts and spirits,” as is suitable to that chapter (“Minggui,” “Explaining Ghosts”), rather than of the existence or nonexistence (*you / wu* 有 / 無 or, alternatively *wang* 亡) of “destiny” (*ming* 命). I find the “ghosts and spirits” context more appropriate to the discussion of existence, and thus treat the passage as more “authentic” in chapter 31 H than in “Feiming” chapter 36 or 35.<sup>96</sup> The section has obviously been reused and adapted to the “Feiming” problematique with a minimum of “thematic” readjustment.

### Conclusion

It is in a sense ironic that the act of “tracing the lines of development and divergence” in what Graham understood as “the oral tradition itself”<sup>97</sup> is made possible today by what I see as a far greater sharing of primary material among the different “schools” of Mohism, and hence among the “sects” themselves, than Graham seems to have allowed for. In his reconstruction of the Y and J chapters from the “Feiming” triad, Graham did not try to secure his findings through a prospective count of characters per slip (as he had previously done in his study of the *Mozi* “Logic” chapters). This is simply because such counting is much more difficult to apply to the “Essay” chapters than it was to the more technical yet more homogeneous “Logic” chapters. Graham found that the original texts from which “Logic” chapters 40 to 45 of the *Mozi* were compiled were only three in number. But I think that the documents we may be able to reconstruct out of the “Essays” will eventually turn out to be much more fragmentary and lacunary, and much more numerous. As their identity becomes clearer, “isocolometrical analysis” will undoubtedly come in handy once again, as a way of grasping the individual history of those “internal” documents which were the well-guarded property of the various schools of Mohism down to the time when they became incorporated into the Y, H, and J “documents.”

I suggested at the beginning of this study that such “internal” documents had the material form of relatively short *ce*. They may have been bound or unbound, with their endings left blank. I suggested that such *ce* were at times bound together into longer and more authoritative *pian*, which themselves must have come undone at times, and that those

96. See Graham, *Divisions in Early Mohism*, 16. Chapter 37 H presently lacks the illustration for the “ears and eyes” test; Graham saw it as a lacuna in the text.

97. Graham, *Divisions in Early Mohism*, 28.

times must have offered the occasion, as long as the Mohist schools remained active, for rearranging the material within the *pian*, as well as for adding to it and subtracting from it. The problem is not so much practical as it is “psychological”: to what extent did the individual members of the different Mohist schools dare to intervene actively in the composition and recomposition of what had already taken the form of full *pian*? In an alternative scenario, we might postulate that the members of the different schools had on hand a number of short *ce* as well as a number of already authoritatively transmitted *pian* from which they then quoted as they saw fit when setting out to compose what would thus be entirely new, and once more fully authoritative, pieces of writing. But the form of individual creativity I see at work in the “Essays” would be very different from that of a “strong” modern “author.” It would be more akin to the creativity of an active compiler or inventive “bricoleur” who maintains a basic respect for the integrity of at least some of the varied items he has on hand. The place where he would have felt freer to “elaborate” at will, much in the manner of a modern “author,” would have been the *ce*, not the *pian*. Both of these scenarios send us back to pursue further research on the *ce*.